LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
AUG 13 1947
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

D16
.86.E21

God in History

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
AUG 13 1947
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

God in History

By Sherwood Eddy

⁂

ASSOCIATION PRESS NEW YORK 1947

Copyright, 1947, by
THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF
YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

PAGE

Foreword vii

CHAPTER I. *The Meaning of History* 1

Beyond a naturalistic interpretation of history. Not God only nor man only. Over long perspectives. Today's critical need for a Christian view of history. Elements in the Christian view of history. A criterion for the appraisal of history: *Justice; Brotherhood; Liberty; Love.* Applying the four criteria to history.

CHAPTER II. *God in Evolution : In Nature and History* 27

The witness of evolution. The witness of education.

CHAPTER III. *God in the Mid-current of History* 44

1. THE SUMERIAN CIVILIZATION OF UR. The story of Abraham.
2. THE DAWN OF CONSCIENCE IN EGYPT
3. THE ETHICAL MONISM OF THE HEBREWS. The Hebrews in Palestine. Divine revelation and prophetic discovery.
4. THE HELLENIC HERITAGE. Alexander and the first world empire.
5. THE ROMAN SYNTHESIS

SUMMARY: Our inheritance of western civilization.

PAGE

CHAPTER IV. *Toward a Philosophy of History* 104

1. THE BIBLICAL PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY
2. ST. AUGUSTINE'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY
3. HEGEL AND HIS INFLUENCE
4. MARX IN THE MODERN WORLD. The Philosophy of Karl Marx.
5. SPENGLER'S DECLINE OF THE WEST
6. ARNOLD TOYNBEE'S STUDY OF HISTORY
7. OTHER PHILOSOPHIES OF HISTORY

CHAPTER V. *God in Modern History* 146

1. THE CRISES OF HISTORY. Secularism and separation from God.
2. IS GOD IN ANGLO-SAXON HISTORY? In English History. The American dream. Realistic American History.
3. IS GOD WORKING IN RUSSIA? Two sides of the shield: the Russian side. Two sides of the shield: the American side. Good and evil in Russia.

CHAPTER VI. *The Meaning of the Present World Situation* 207

The world revolution. Tension between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. Crisis in capitalism. The new atomic age. The problems of America. The British Empire. The problem of Palestine. The problem of China.

CHAPTER VII. *The Christian Clue to History* 238

The significance of Christianity. Is Christianity unique? The judgment of God in history. From war to peace. The Christian as God's instrument. Is God limited? The final solution.

Index 279

FOREWORD

For many years, the question: Is God in History? has forced itself upon my attention. An early breakdown in India exiled me to Egypt where I became fascinated with the excavations and lectures of the great archaeologist, Professor Flinders Petrie, and made my first visit to Palestine. Later I journeyed to Carchemish to inspect the work of Sir Leonard Wooley and discuss his excavations at Ur. That was my first introduction to the ancient civilizations of the Sumerians at Ur, and to those in Egypt and Palestine. I shall deal in this book with five successive and interrelated ancient civilizations—Ur, Egypt, Palestine, Greece, and Rome —which seem to form the very mid-current of history that produced our Western civilization, with all its brilliant achievements and glaring imperfections. I am not unmindful of the discoveries and early attainments of ancient India and China, and I am deeply moved when I look upon the "Peking man," as the earliest subhuman remains known upon the planet. But high as were their ancient cultures, these Orientals were not our ancestors and could not be held in the least responsible for the failures of our civilization.

It may well be said that the whole plan of this book is an oversimplification. The writing of all history is inevitably an oversimplification. The world itself could not contain the books that would have to be written to record all the insignificant details of a universal history in its infinite variety. There is confessedly an oversimplification also in the selection of the four principles, or conditions, or cornerstones, for a just and lasting peace and for the building of a better world—justice, brotherhood, liberty, and love to God and man—as evidence of a divine hand in history. There are, of course, more than four principles involved, but the limitations of one brief volume preclude their consideration.

I am indebted to Professor Edgar S. Brightman for a discussion of the plan of this book and especially of the obvious difficulties in the way of believing that God is working effectively in history in the light of the tragic aspects of natural law for which man is not to blame, and of the results of man's awful measure of freedom revealed in the agony of World War II and its aftermath. Dr. Brightman believes that God is limited in a way that I do not. We are all forced to a realistic consideration of the unsolved—and perhaps insoluble—problem of evil and the demonic abyss that has yawned before us not only in the total war and slave states of a Hitler and his Nazi gangsters, but in ourselves. We have no alibi nor scapegoat here. *We* are the problem, not Hitler alone. We are God's problem and our own.

It is because I am absolutely sure in my own mind that God is indeed working and working effectively and ceaselessly in history that I am constrained to write. I have no desire to restate the arguments for the existence of God, nor to raise the question as to whether the actors and makers of history consciously recognize God at work in their lives. Of the two brothers in Jesus' parable, the one who at first refused to go and do the father's bidding, but finally went and did it, was commended rather than the younger son who said "I go, sir" and went not (Matthew 21[28]). Jesus' contemporary followers have been ready with profuse professions and promises, but few have done the will of God—especially in the matter of economic justice and racial brotherhood. There may be others who do not know whether there be a God, who are yet passionately concerned with justice as they understand it, and with what we call racial brotherhood;

and they may be doing God's will in these two important matters when many American Christians are perhaps God's chief problem. It will be hard for us to realize this contradiction today just as it was for the Pharisees, who were the most religious people of their time. It seems as if we were being specifically warned in the present crisis as to whether we are able to discern "the signs of the times" and the meaning of this era: i.e., the meaning of history in our own day.

I write as a member of a group of theological realists of whom Reinhold Niebuhr, Paul Tillich, Henry Sloane Coffin, Henry Van Dusen, and John Bennett are the best known. My debt throughout this volume will be obvious to Niebuhr, Tillich, and many others. My obligations are far too many to enumerate but they will be quite evident to the reader. I have more often abbreviated or paraphrased the writings of many authors rather than quoted from them in detail, but the book lays no claim to originality nor to my competence to write upon this obviously difficult theme. I am especially grateful to Dr. Edgar S. Brightman and to Dudley Zuver for having read portions of the manuscript and for making helpful suggestions regarding it.

As a word of warning, the reader will find that history itself is very broad and pluralistic; it is at least three dimensional, and it is always a strange mixture of good and evil, full of apparent contradictions. It is not all stark black and white, and it does not fit snugly into any of our preconceived neat little patterns. It is vast and various and complex. There can be no pharisaic or puritanical hard and fast line drawn between the so-called sacred and secular. We are concerned in this book with man's total life: the moral and spiritual, the intellectual and esthetic, the economic and political, the individual and social. Limitations of space will not permit us to give a full picture of the life in ancient Ur and Babylon, in Egypt, Palestine, Greece, and Rome; or in present-day America or Soviet Russia. But at least the reader must not expect a narrow, labeled, compartmentalized, and painfully religious history, which at every stage will prosaically point a moral and say: "See, God was here and God was there, doing this and that." God himself does not deal with us in this manner for he is "a God that hideth himself," a God of mystery, who is often a problem to us, as man is to himself and is perhaps to God. Even his chosen people find it hard to understand his ways.

SHERWOOD EDDY

March 1, 1947

God in History

CHAPTER I

THE MEANING OF HISTORY

IT REQUIRES TEMERITY at a time like this to attempt to write upon such a subject as *God in History*. During an age of faith, or in a period of prosperity such as the nineteenth century, or in the first flush of the brilliant achievements of modern science, when the almost automatic progress of triumphant evolution seemed assured, an optimist might cry with Browning:

God's in his heaven—
All's right with the world.

But who can hold lightheartedly a shallow optimism amid the wreckage of World Wars I and II and face the imminent menace, not yet averted, of World War III? Even though Tennyson's description of "nature red in tooth and claw" is exaggerated, can we seriously hold, in view of man's far greater cruelty and carnage, that God is really working effectively in history today?

Another factor which calls for pause before attempting such a task is the inevitable recognition of the painful limits of human reason. We are no longer in the hopeful dawn of the Renaissance or of the confident Enlightenment. We are aware at the outset that complete demonstration is quite impossible in this sphere of life. We can neither prove philosophically the existence of God, nor his nonexistence. We can neither demonstrate conclusively that God is in history nor that he is not: "For nothing worthy proving can be proven, nor yet disproven." Man's agelong effort to transcend belief and to attain security or intellectual certainty through the demonstration of reason has been wellnigh fruitless. We live by faith; "we know in part" in experience; then we reflect upon our fractional experience in our limited reason. Science yields but the barest skeleton of life. Our limited knowledge is but an instrument of more knowledge. We are everywhere surrounded by the unknown; we are appalled at "the little done, the undone vast"; the little known, the unknown infinite. Yet our humiliating ignorance is not our weakest point. We do even less than we know. We must ask why we fail so disastrously and so repeatedly upon the plane of history.

If there were no God, there would be no supreme mind in the universe, and the world as a whole could never have been thought or loved or willed. If there were no mind apart from the brain of the finite individual, there could be no science, for science depends on an ordered, rational world, and it implies two minds, the one producing, the other understanding and responding. If there were no God, there would be no plan or purpose in the universe, no significant meaning or adequate goal in history. There could be no true religion in touch with ultimate reality, no answered prayer, no logical place for divine worship, no ground of absolute moral obligation. Neither the starry heavens above nor the moral law within would fill us with awe, for there would be no moral law in an amoral material universe. There would be no sure and certain hope for the future of mankind, for the individual or for the race.

Though we believe that demonstration is impossible here, many of us are completely assured that we have discovered God in experience. We have found God not only in nature and in human nature but in a world of values. If the ultimate values of the universe are found not in mechanism but in purpose, if the values of the true, the beautiful, and the good are grounded in an infinite Intelligence and Love and Purpose, then the recognition of value and obedience to moral obligation, coupled with spiritual insight, may at least make a beginning in searching for the secret of life and the meaning of history.

BEYOND A NATURALISTIC INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY

We must begin with a study of history before asking if it has any meaning, and with nature before asking if there is anything beyond it. Professor Frederick J. E. Woodbridge in *The Purpose of History* seeks a purely naturalistic or rational interpretation both of nature and history. He holds that man is so constituted that the pursuit of happiness is a necessity of his being. When he is unsatisfied both in nature and history, the moment he reflects he is bound to ask the question: Is life worthwhile? This question has haunted man for ages, for the nature of his being compels him to question. Beyond his experience with imperfect nature, man is forced to conceive of an idea or ideal beyond nature. However inarticulate, man's first dualism arises between nature and a possible supernatural, between knowledge and faith, between an unsatisfying real and a beckoning ideal. Much later, science grows out of man's use of tools and the practical needs of counting, calculating, and measuring. But long before he dreams of science or philosophy, which arise later still from reflection, religion is the very heart of his daily life. Primitive man is by nature an animist, not a materialist. Nature stirs in him the suspicion of a plot or design, of purpose first conceived and then executed.

Both mechanism and design force themselves into man's experience as supplementary and complementary. If history is both a chain of events and their records, early man discovers no purpose in history in the sense of some future event towards which the whole creation moves. But man begins to use the past as material for the present, for the progressive utilization of spiritual ends. For history is itself the utilization of the past for ends to come, so that every historical event has the appearance of something more than an accident. It seems to be a result which had been selected.

For illustration, Herodotus, well called the father of history, was conscious of his own purpose in writing. He gave his history to the world "in order that the things men have done might not in time be forgotten and that the great and wonderful deeds of both Greeks and barbarians might not become unheard of." His work is not only an account of a thrilling struggle (the war between the Greeks and Persians), it is the expression of a whole man, the representation of all the world seen through the medium of one mind and in a particular perspective. Herodotus finds meaning and divine purpose in history. He is too sympathetic to be consistently critical or to remain cold toward the earnest beliefs of people about him. He shares from the outset their tendency to read the activity of a moral God in all the moving events of history.[1]

Taking Herodotus as a typical Greek historian, this raises for us at the outset the question of historical relativism and of historical criticism. We believe in historical relativism in the sense that no historical fact can ever have its history fully written. We never see absolutely the thing in itself or the event in itself. We must distinguish between the real past and our imperfect record of it. We can never be certain of the exact details of a past event, or the very words in the oral teaching of any great prophet. The objective events are inevitably tinged with our own appreciation, colored by our own ideas. By the method of historical criticism, however, we are bound as far as we can to reconstruct and reinterpret the past and its records in the light of our own experience.

Herodotus' history becomes an item in the history of Greece which must ever be retold and reinterpreted. Our written history is thus a selection and utilization of material, a realization of ends, a movement with a purpose in it. The movement of time is not primarily a movement from the past to the future, but from the possible to the actual. The present is the concrete transforming of the possible into the actual. As Emerson said: "Now is the nick of time in matters that reach into eternity." For weal or woe we are the makers of history. Thus every act and every page of our irrevocable history is fateful. But history is pluralistic. There may be as many histories as there are historians of varying viewpoints. The history of the English people may be regarded, in one aspect, as a development of personal liberty. The Magna Carta is without meaning apart from this movement or idea of liberty. The meaning we find in history is bound to be selective. We may subjectively read this meaning in, or objectively find it out in history.

---

[1] Gilbert Murray, *Ancient Greek Literature,* New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1908, p. 133.

There is indeed purpose in history, whether as the converging of human means upon a specific end, or as denoting a possible divine design, intention, and fulfillment. History is not only the conserving, remembering, and understanding of what has happened, but, under the principle of continuity, the completing of what has been begun. We must not only try to understand history, we must make it. Man is not primarily a historian but an actor. The purpose of history is not necessarily a lost secret, incomprehensible. It is a kind of life in which faith and reason enable man to live. These are the two feet upon which he advances. Because he is man, he cannot live as an animal, he cannot live at his best as a positivist. He must ask not only what, and how, but why. Opaque nature drives him beyond nature, and unsatisfied in history he is driven beyond history to ask its inner meaning. The realist must grope for the ideal, the naturalist must reach out toward the possible supernatural.

NOT GOD ONLY NOR MAN ONLY

History must have meaning in so far as God is in it. Perhaps we may conceive of history as the joint work of God and man. Like the warp and woof of a great tapestry, we may think of God's eternal purpose as the warp, and of man's brief and broken handiwork as the cross threads of the woof. If God only were working, history might be all his story. We may form but the faintest conception of what that story might be, of what the eye of man hath not seen nor his ear heard, if we can conceive of the fulfillment of Jesus' prayer, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven." If this is God's universe, we believe that his story will yet be told and his will done, not only on earth, but beyond it in God's eternal plan.

Though it would be impossible for the modern realist, after the second world war of this generation and under the dark shadow of its aftermath, to write thus, Hegel closes his great *Philosophy of History* with these remarkable words: "Philosophy concerns itself only with the glory of the Idea mirroring itself in the History of the World. . . . That the History of the World, with all the changing scenes which its annals present, is this process of development and the realization of Spirit—this is the true *Theodicea,* the justification of God in history. Only *this* insight can reconcile Spirit with the History of the World—viz., that *what has happened, and is happening every day, is not only not 'without God,' but is essentially His Work*" (Italics ours). Here Hegel goes almost as far as the *Shorter Catechism:* "God hath foreordained for His own glory everything that comes to pass."

The Hebrew prophets, and Jesus speaking in the prophetic line, held a similar view of history, not of the working of an impersonal Idea but of a personal God. And they believed this not only when things were going well but, most of all, in the darkest hours of gloom and tragedy. They recognized also, however, as Hegel never did, the awful reality of man's sin. The captivity of Israel and then of Judah, the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple, even the crucifixion of him whom they counted the Messiah, were believed only to usher in the New Covenant and Jesus' promise of the coming Kingdom of God, both within history and beyond it. Beyond the utmost reach of man's sin and its tragic results, God was to have the last word.

If not God but man only were active and were making history all by himself, utterly without the grace of God and his providence, we might have only the torture chambers of the Gestapo and almost the hell on earth Hitler made of his degraded slave states and prison camps. For surely hell itself could be nothing more than the complete exclusion of God from life. But when both God and man are working—and often at cross purposes—we have the present tragic war-torn world, or war's aftermaths and interludes of "peace." We have war on earth because man is at war with himself and with the will of God. It is not surprising if the workman or weaver, handling only a few threads or strands of his woof at a time, with his attention fixed upon a single point in the pattern—the here and now of his day's work—cannot see the whole plan of the tapestry of life upon which he is working, especially if he ignores the warp of God's purpose in history. The weaver may even seem to be working at his loom, as in a treadmill, "having no hope and without God in the world."

OVER LONG PERSPECTIVES

The realist must look, however, not only at the reality and depth of man's sin but to the height of his stature as a son of God. The spiritual man, though dependent on society, yet stands at the full religious height of his freedom over the community. From this height, in the bold sweep of his memory and imagination, man surveys the ages, he contemplates time and conceives of eternity, he can study both the beginnings and estimate some of the ends of history. Though he sees man's tragic frustrations and failures, he can still, over long perspectives, also see broad evidences of progress. He can construct not only idealistic utopias to guide him, but relevant realistic programs for his improving social order. He can see even beyond the yawning chasms and abysses of world wars and catastrophes to high tablelands of human achievement in the new atomic era, not only of recovery, reform, and reconstruction, but even to new creations and a better social order for man.

Man can survey his ever-widening social units in the family, the tribe, and the nation, but he is finally driven to the inevitable goal of the global organization of one world. This is not only an idealistic construction but his realistic salvation from long centuries of warfare whose cumulative destruction now threatens his whole civilization. Catastrophe only drives him to achieve his higher destiny, which is only possible in peace. The human personality, standing at the summit of long ages of natural evolution and of subhuman and human achievement, finally realizes that man's freedom over nature makes history possible and his freedom over history places him on a final pinnacle where he is able to ask questions of the meaning of history and of life itself.

All the failures, and frustrations, of man's life only drive him beyond time to eternity and to his ultimate spiritual goals which lie not only within history but beyond it. The long ages of advance of inorganic and later organic evolution, the millenniums of pre-history and the whole of history as a flux in time—all imply eternity. The man who has a vital experience of God in his spiritual Kingdom will believe with Sir Oliver Lodge that it is not given to man to have thoughts better than the truth of things. Only a consciousness that transcends time can see beyond and triumph over the flux of time. As Reinhold Niebuhr says:

> The man who searches after both meaning and fulfillments beyond the ambiguous fulfillments and frustrations of history exists in a height of spirit which no historical process can completely contain. . . . The problem of the individual and the community cannot be solved at all if the height is not achieved where the sovereign source and end of both individual and communal existence are discerned, and where the limits are set against the idolatrous self-worship of both individuals and communities.[2]

---

[2] Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943, pp. 84, 85.

In a word, all is possible in God, but nothing without him. History finds its end, and life its meaning, only in God. If this is God's universe, history will yet find its full significance and ultimate promise. If it is not, we have achieved and can hope to attain almost nothing and that little only for mortal man's brief day.

TODAY'S CRITICAL NEED FOR A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF HISTORY

The question of the meaning of history is obviously of immediate practical importance. Our very language today suggests a vocabulary of crisis. We speak constantly of "the end of an era," "the decline of the West," "the shadow of tomorrow," "the wave of the future," etc. We contrast prewar and postwar eras that seem to stand for two different worlds. And there is no hope of putting the clock back to the "normalcy" of peace, prosperity, and economic booms. History, like time, "marches on." We feel ourselves in the grip of vast forces, utterly beyond our comprehension or control. We are like chips on the surging surface of a tide that will bear us far beyond our ken, whether for weal or woe. If ever, now of all times we must ask the meaning of history.

In the volume on *The Kingdom of God and History,* prepared for the Conference on Church, Community, and State held at Oxford in 1937, Professor E. W. Lyman, Paul Tillich, and others discuss the meaning of history. They show that we have already witnessed the disastrous effects of the evolutionary optimistic view of history prevalent during the modern period. This view combined the eighteenth century rationalistic idea of progress, which was organically related to the mechanical conception of physical nature and to universal reason in humanity, with the idea of automatic development which was propagated by the romantic movement. The idea of development as a universal law was rooted in natural science through the Darwinian doctrine of evolution and was blended rather arbitrarily by Herbert Spencer with the idea of progress. The result of this fusion of the ideas of progress and development has been the evolutionary optimism characteristic of the individualistic liberalism of our own day. This led to the conclusion that however individuals or pressure groups may pursue their own selfish ends for special privilege, automatic progress will be slow but sure. Natural laws of laissez-faire political economy, where each seeks his own, will work out under a beneficent providence for general human welfare. The social consequences of this shallow optimism often led to frustration, confusion, and despair and this false philosophy of history broke down.

In striking contrast with the evolutionary optimistic views of history and all naturalistic or idealistic interpretations stands the Christian view of history. It challenges all the demonic forces in the modern world of autonomous capitalism, irresponsible nationalism and the materialization and dehumanization of the masses under absolute totalitarian dictatorships. The problem of the world's history is distinctively a Christian problem and challenge. It has always been a dominant characteristic of the Hebrew-Christian religion to interpret human existence in terms of meaningful history, instead of in terms of nature or of meaningless repetitive cycles of existence as did the Greeks. Whether it can be proved to be true or not, we shall find that the Christian interpretation of history is certainly the highest that we know, and that it is not too good to be true. The great Christian doctrines of creation, redemption, and providence have always subordinated nature to history and have held that history had a higher meaning.

If we compare our modern period of crises with the end of the ancient world at the fall of Rome, there appears to be the same need of a religious solution of the world problem, which is found to be insoluble without religion. Can the Christian interpretation of history meet the dilemma in which the evolutionary optimistic, humanistic, and naturalistic views leave us, and can it overcome the demonic forces of the modern world mentioned above?

ELEMENTS IN THE CHRISTIAN VIEW OF HISTORY

We view history as the total sequence of human lives on our planet made up of the innumerable experiences and voluntary choices of men and women of the past, together with the experiences and voluntary choices by which we make history in the present. If this conflicting and contradictory mass of facts were all, history could only be at best a vast anarchy and chaos. But we believe there is a uniting and co-ordinating invisible source and center of history in the overruling Kingdom of God which is as yet only fractionally realized in actual history. And we believe that God is somehow even now the Lord of history, as he will in some way at some time be its fulfillment and full realization. This God is not a static reality but one who does "mighty works" in history which the prophet or believer can dimly trace by faith and spiritual insight. In the Hebraic, Zoroastrian, and Christian religions, the time-process of history finds its end and fulfillment in the Kingdom of God. And the believer can best live his life on the plane of tragic history by following the command "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God" and the righteousness of his moral order. The whole drama of history lies within the framework of a philosophy of history according to which the moral will of God is in control of all events, whatever be the measure of man's freedom or sin.

The Christian view is founded upon the deepest and highest ethical monotheism known to man. Herein history is grounded in the moral will of God and controlled by that will. The covenant relation between God and his people is initiated through an act of God in history. In the prophetic teaching, history receives its meaning from a series of divine acts which rest on God's moral will, but in which men also take a responsible and active part. No other view of history so makes men fellow workers with God and gives such divine meaning to human events. The entrance of Jesus Christ into history and the work of the Apostle Paul presuppose this high interpretation of history and deepen and extend its meaning. In Christ, Christianity sees the appearance of the ultimate meaning of life in history. Where God enters human life we call it the center of history and this center determines the aim of history.

In the Christian view, Christ is the center of history, the realization of the Kingdom of God is the end, and the first expectation of the Kingdom is the beginning of spiritual or significant history. History is not truly measured by billions of years of astronomical or evolutionary time. The meaning of history is found in the final fulfillment of all historical possibilities, where man achieves the purpose of his life, the end of his being. The word Kingdom is a symbol drawn from social and political life to express the sovereignty of God, his rule and realm. It is at once the symbolic expression of the ultimate meaning of existence and a tool for the Christian interpretation of history. The Kingdom of God stands above and in contrast to the warring imperialistic kingdoms of the world. The spiritual kingdom is a dynamic power actually working in history and materializing itself on earth, and though it never becomes identified with history, it is expected to triumph over these kingdoms of the world.

The Kingdom of God is the symbolic expression of the relationship of the unconditioned meaning of existence to man's actual life. The Kingdom is a dynamic conception. It is never completed but always becoming, and always "at hand." It implies that the living God is not the aloof, unmoved mover lost in meditation, but that he enters history, struggles in history, and fulfills it. For the Christian, Christ becomes the center of history and reveals its final meaning. We believe that we rightly divide history between B.C. and A.D. and so history can best be understood. It makes not only a theoretical but the greatest practical difference whether one believes with Bertrand Russell and other agnostics that "only on the firm foundation of unyielding despair can the soul's habitation henceforth be safely built"—or whether, on the eternal foundation on which the universe is created, we welcome the sovereignty of God, we receive "a Kingdom which cannot be shaken," and can say with confidence "I know whom I have trusted."

And our faith is daily validated in solid experience. Christ appeared in history in the "fullness of time" as the fulfillment of long historic preparation. He appeared just when the three principal nations that were in the mid-current of history—Greece, Rome, and Judea—had each reached the end of a blind alley and had little creative to contribute for the redemption of history or the solving of its problems. If at this point of man's extremity God broke into history—the divine into the human, the eternal into the temporal—tragic history was redeemed and fulfilled. The Christian interpretation of history thus considers the history of mankind ultimately as the history of salvation—man's only ultimate salvation. It believes there is no escaping God, or Christ, for any final solution of the problem of history, or for any adequate conception of its meaning. Certainly self-sufficient man cannot point to our own epoch with its series of global wars and revolutions, to boast that he has found the solution of the problem of history without God.

In the Christian view we hold a dynamic concept of history under a dialectic advancing from its ever-partial thesis, through its negative antithesis of human tragedy, to an ever-wider synthesis which may more and more approximate the ideal and end that lies within the Kingdom of God. Even in the midst of tragedy and failure this gives us eternal hope. This conception of the Kingdom of God, which was always central in the teaching of Jesus, means the kingship and rule of God who at once actualizes history and yet transcends everything that ever can be realized by fallible man in history. For the believer, history thus has a direction and a goal determined by the eternal values of God's nature, in a Kingdom that is both present and future, partly realized and partly yet to come. Like an iceberg that exists in two elements, the Kingdom of God partakes of the mystery of being both in time and eternity, both divine and human, both in history and beyond it.[3]

Only the believer in the meaning of history can say:

One God, one law, one element,
And one far-off divine event,
To which the whole creation moves.

A CRITERION FOR THE APPRAISAL OF HISTORY

Before we attempt to study and evaluate history we must seek a criterion by which we may judge it. We shall maintain in this book that there are preeminently four principles or cornerstones upon which we may hope to build an enduring social order in which the good life for man may be realized. They form the necessary conditions for realizing a just and lasting peace and for the building of a better world. And they become our final touchstones as a criterion of the presence of God in history. *The four principles which we find are fundamental for the full realization of man's life are: (1) Justice; (2) Brotherhood; (3) Liberty; and (4) Love.* Why are these among the supreme principles of life, why are they a criterion for the criticism of history, and whence are they derived?

A study of history shows that God has established an order in creation and that man's life can only be realized as it is true to that order. As truly as the law of gravity is embedded in the material universe, so truly God's nature is revealed in the structures of life. And these structures are discovered through experience. In universal human experience many find that *love is the ultimate law of life.*[4] Man cannot be himself or realize himself except in love. By love we mean not some sentimental emotion, nor erotic relation between the sexes, but the great principle which polarizes all life between the love of God and man. Out of the depths of human experience, grounded in history—not only in two thousand years of Hebrew ethical monotheism, but in universal spiritual experience as well—Jesus states the two great commandments upon which rest the whole Law and the prophets, and that are the foundation of the Christian religion: "You must love the Lord your God with your whole heart, with your whole soul, with your whole mind, and with your whole strength. The second is this: You must love your neighbor as yourself."[5]

---

[3] Cf. H. G. Wood, *The Kingdom of God and History,* Chicago, Willett, Clark and Co., 1938, pp. 75-141.

[4] Plato discovered this, and Gautama Buddha long before him. Moti, or Mo-tzu, in China preached mutual love and denounced war. Even the rationalist, David Hume, sees that in every moral code love is better than selfishness. On the physical plane of life, ecstatic love is man's highest experience, and on the spiritual plane, at the height of his being, love, or the full sharing of life, links man to God and to his fellows. Paul finds in experience that "love is the link of the perfect life" (Col. 3^{14}).

Here are three factors: The perfect relation of man to God as the source and center of his life; the ultimate internal harmony of the personality with itself in all of its desires and impulses, "with your whole heart, with your whole soul, with your whole mind"; and the perfect harmony of life with life: "You must love your neighbor as yourself." Here love is the completion, the fulfillment of life, and its ultimate law. But because of sin, when man places himself instead of God at the center of life, no man loves God perfectly, he is not unified and integrated in a harmonious personality in his whole heart and soul and mind, and he does not love his neighbor as himself. Where God is ignored and the sinful self becomes the center, where the love of God does not undergird and complete the relation of man to man, the differences which sin accentuates, the differences of geography, race, color, time, place and history, separate men one from another. Instead of love as the full sharing of life, we have war as the final destruction of life. Love is the ultimate source from which all our principles are derived and it becomes the end term in any system of morals.

---

[5] The first command is from the Jewish Shema, so called from the first word in the Hebrew—*Hear*. This is the first Scripture taught to Jewish children. It is the Hebrew's confession of faith, his declaration of monotheism. The one God demands the whole man. Jesus, with every devout Jew, repeated this Shema daily and made it one of the two twin pillars of true religion. "Listen, Israel: The Eternal, the Eternal alone, is our God. And you must love the Eternal your God with all your mind and all your soul and all your strength. These words you must learn by heart, this charge of mine: you must impress them on your children, you must talk about them when you are sitting at home and when you are on the road, when you lie down and when you rise up. You must tie them on your hands as a memento, and wear them on your forehead as a badge; you must inscribe them on the door-posts of your houses and on your gates. . . . You must not put the Eternal your God to the proof. . . . He made you feel your need of him, he let you hunger and then fed you with manna . . . that he might make you know that man lives not only by food but by every word that comes out of the lips of the Eternal."

Once sin is presupposed, man requires justice as a more crude but concrete application of the law of love. Man's darkened life requires the calculations of justice which is made necessary by the complexity of the conflicting claims of love in the family, the state, the church, and all other human relations and institutions. Man thus has to approach perfect love through the cruder calculations of justice. Brotherhood is the achievement of love realized in ever-widening social circles—in the family, the tribe, the nation, the religious community, the world—till it includes all mankind. According to the Stoics, the two derivatives of justice are liberty and equality. Anglo-Saxons and all bourgeois societies always emphasize the principle of liberty, while the Russians stress equality.

What Russia means by democracy is equality, the equal distribution of land to the peasants and the relative equality and equal justice of a classless society. What Anglo-Saxons mean by democracy is the liberty of the four freedoms: the holding of free elections, freedom of the press, and so on. Each conception of democracy seems so foreign to the other that it appears as hypocrisy, though both are looking at two sides of the same shield, from the standpoint of their different inheritance. Overemphasis on liberty tends to anarchy while exclusive preoccupation with justice in terms of economic equality only, leads to tyranny. The definitions and the experiences of each individual and nation, each ideological system and sect, are necessarily one-sided. We slowly discover through human experience the structure of life. In experience, confirmed by human reason, and imbedded in the Hebrew-Christian Scriptures—as well as in other religions and philosophies and systems—we reach the above four principles of life which become our criterion for the criticism of history.

According to the Hebrew tradition, in the building of the tabernacle where man was to meet God, Moses was told: "See that you make everything according to the pattern shown you on the mountain" (Ex. 25^{40}; Heb. 8^{5}). This was the pattern for the old order of the Law. For the new social order our four principles have come out of the heart of life and of human experience and we shall find that they form a criterion for the criticism of history and a pattern for the realizing of the meaning of history. The four cornerstones become four touchstones as a criterion of judgment by which we may test any given social structure, or national achievement to see whether it be of God.

We do not claim that the list is exhaustive or that there are *only* four values or principles involved.[6] We must be constantly on our guard against dogmatism and oversimplification, in trying to fit history into any preconceived mold or system. History is far more complex than any artificial man-made system or philosophy. Nevertheless we shall find these principles increasingly validated in our continuing experience. In so far as we fulfill these conditions, we have peace on earth; when they are grossly violated we have war, revolution, and incessant strife. Selfish egotism and irresponsible nationalism always deny full justice, equal brotherhood, complete liberty, and the love of God and man. The moment God is left out of the center of life, history becomes tragedy, peace gives place to war. Herein is the central importance of religion which relates man's life to God and calls upon the prodigal individual and a prodigal humanity to repent and return to God. And vital, dynamic, whole religion, both individual and social, can only be realized in the love of God and man. Faith is the means, while love is the very heart and soul and end of religion. Thus, only, do we see life steadily and make it whole.

---

[6] Dr. Edgar S. Brightman in his *Nature and Values,* New York, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1945, pp. 106-107, would include reason here. He finds the essence of Christianity in *logos* and *agape,* reason and love, in an indivisible whole. Certainly I do not favor Tertullian's antipathy to reason, nor Nazi irrationalism, though I cannot include reason with our four principles.

Because these principles are all derived from love, they are closely interrelated and interdependent, yet for practical purposes they are irreducible and not equated. We cannot say, for instance, that if we only had love the other principles would be unnecessary. Even those who profess to love God are sometimes sadly lacking in the passion for justice and are blind to its necessity. Justice and liberty are also closely related but not equated. If justice is denied, there is little liberty, and if there is no liberty, there cannot be full justice. The principles according to which God has created the world are identical with the principles according to which man must order his moral and social life. We shall find that they are expressions of the character of God, and that they are alike the experience of man, the revelation of God, and the categorical imperatives of the practical reason. Our four principles are not merely beautiful ideals, but they express the very foundations of reality. When the doings of man conform to the nature and purpose of God, man shares in and appropriates the creative power of God. Then God's will is effective in history and man achieves peace and realizes the ends of his being. When man fails to do God's will and transgresses, he ceases to be creative; when he opposes God's will he becomes destructive, but malignant evil under the judgment of God always tends to destroy itself. Cumulative human testimony confirms the experience of Gamaliel and his philosophy of history:

> If this project or enterprise (or history) springs from men, it will collapse; whereas if it really springs from God, you will be unable to put them down. You may even find yourselves fighting God.[7]

---

[7] Acts 5^{38}.

We have caught a glimpse in recent history of the possibilities of a gangsters' world that repudiates God and the moral order, and of a materialistic world where mass man is made for the state and thinks he can live by material bread alone, denying in his thought and profession the very existence of God. Righteousness means harmony with the will of the Creator. God is in history most fully when man is in harmony with God.

1. Justice

We cannot give abstract definitions of these four principles, for often each can be defined only as related to some particular social order. To Plato, for instance, justice is the last and greatest of the four Greek virtues (wisdom, courage, self-control, and justice), the all-inclusive virtue of the ideal state. It is the inner law of measure, balance, health, and happiness, the well-being of the governing element of the soul, the *summum bonum* of the individual life where every "part of the soul" "does its own business," and of the life of the state where each class—whether of philosophers, soldiers, or artisans—performs its appropriate function.[8] Ideally, justice should include both duties and rights. Plato emphasized almost exclusively the duties, while Marx and the modern proletariat emphasize the rights of man in a particular society. For neither Plato nor Marx did justice mean meticulous equality. Both saw that one man was possessed of one talent, another of two, another of five. The genius in science or art needs more to develop his gift if he is to fulfill his duty by rendering his maximum contribution to society. If we seek to balance duties and rights, perhaps we could say that *justice implies that measure of equity in fair distribution to each, which will enable him to develop his full capacities and to render his maximum contribution in service to society.*

---

[8] Plato begins his central work, the *Republic,* as an inquiry into the meaning of justice and then turns to an examination of the life of the just man, which is "writ large" in the life of the just state. In capitalist Britain, Herbert Spencer defines individualistic justice where "every man is free to do that which he wills, provided he infringes not the equal freedom of any other man." Collectivists who emphasize the individual's duty to the state tend towards an approximately equalitarian level. Realistic experience in the socialist state of Soviet Russia, however, substitutes for the future communist ideal "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need," the immediate practical imperative "from each according to his ability *to each according to his labor.*" Justice under utilitarian socialism means that each is paid according to the quantity and quality of his labor. In each of the three societies mentioned above, justice can only be defined in relation to a given social order.

Whether we consider the duties or rights of the individual or of the state, justice is the cornerstone, the first of the four imperative principles necessary for an enduring or even tolerable social order. It is the denial of justice that drives desperate men to revolution throughout history. True to universal human experience, justice was the first demand of the prophets of the Hebrew-Christian Scriptures, as it had been in ancient Egypt before them. The first moral demand of the prophet Amos twenty-seven centuries ago (c. 765-750 B.C.) was for justice, that the rich stop robbing the poor. This became the standard or plumb-line by which God judged his people and it was the repeated demand of the prophets and writers both of the Old and New Testaments. Human justice, however, is never absolute, nor final, nor equal. Plato's harmony of justice is realized best in the fulfillment of Christian love and brotherhood. Thus we shall find our four principles everywhere interrelated but never equated. The honest endeavor to fulfill any one of them, especially the supreme principle of love, leads almost inevitably to all the others.

2. *Brotherhood*

We are driven in the quest for justice to the second principle of brotherhood, for full justice can only be realized in brotherhood. This is true for any race—black or white, brown or yellow—and for any class. Brotherhood is the fundamental requirement of man's existence. When man seeks to organize his life by a balance of power, however, brotherhood is imperiled by various forms of corruption. Will seeks to dominate will as the yoke of imperialism and slavery is placed upon backward or subject peoples and classes. Against these corruptions, the religious ideal of brotherhood must ever be reasserted under the prophetic proclamation of the judgment of God upon man's selfish subjection of his fellow men.

Reason must make the demand of ultimate brotherhood when it conceives of the human race as one family, as did the Stoics. Epictetus thus states his noble belief in brotherhood:

> Sing the hymn to God on behalf of all men. What else can I that am old and lame do but sing to God? With God as our Maker and Father, I am a citizen of the world. Slave, will you not endure your own brother, that has God to his forefather, even as a son. . . . Everything has two handles, one by which it may be borne, the other by which it may not. If your brother sin against you, lay not hold of it by the handle of his injustice, but rather by this, that he is your brother.[9]

These noble words of Epictetus inculcate or imply all our four interrelated cardinal principles of justice, brotherhood, liberty, and love. Jesus widened the content of the word neighbor to include any man in need, and the neighbor became a brother. If any man remembered that his brother had ought against him, he was to cease his worship of God, to leave his gift at the very altar and first be reconciled with his brother. Human brotherhood was grounded in divine love, and God's sons were to love even as their heavenly Father. If there were no God and God were not active in history, the idea of brotherhood would be a mere dream, a figment of the romantic imagination. But if man is made in the image of God and God has entered human history once for all, brotherhood will be the great achievement in the divine intention, realized in the Kingdom of God.

3. Liberty

Liberty is the third principle which is a necessary condition for the realization of the good life and a successful social order. It is not as primitive and basic as justice, but the demand for liberty is lodged deep in the human spirit. Man is involved in the flux of nature, but his ability to transcend and in a measure to control nature gives him the capacity to make and to judge history. While the whole material and animal creation is bound by determinism, man alone is free, or at least capable of conceiving and attaining freedom.

---

[9] The quotations are not continuous but taken at random from *The Golden Sayings of Epictetus,* The Harvard Classics, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, Vol. II, pp. 117-177.

But man is really free only in God, the source of his freedom. Though he may talk of blowing up the planet he will find that he is not free to destroy the ordered universe, though incalculable energy is bound in every atom of it. Without God, neither complete justice, brotherhood, liberty, nor love is realizable. At the height of his stature, man discovers in experience that he is free to develop his capacities and to organize his social and political life under a constitution of political liberty. Freedom was first achieved among the Hebrews and the Greeks, therefore we find it expressed in the religion of the Bible and in the writings of the Greeks, for the whole story of Greece was one long struggle for liberty. Long before democracy was realized in the free city states of Greece, the Hebrews had attained a considerable measure of democratic liberty, though their ideal was always theocracy rather than democracy.

The "four freedoms" were embodied in the Atlantic Charter and many will judge the peace and the world organization agreed upon at San Francisco by the principle of liberty and the recognition of human rights. Up from slavery through feudalism to full democracy, man's history has been one long struggle for freedom. Hegel concludes his *Philosophy of History* with his oft-quoted statement that "the History of the World is nothing but the development of the Idea of Freedom." Certainly we must include it among our four principles.

4. Love

Although it is, as we have seen, the source of all the other principles, in practical living we may take love as the final and highest principle for the building of a better social order. Like many great words in human language, the word love has been prostituted by sensuous associations. Yet it is not altogether amiss that we may be led from the natural to the spiritual by the most vital, dynamic, and ecstatic experience between human beings up to the pure love of God with the whole heart. The dualistic Plato and the sour Puritan wrongly thought of natural love as unclean. The Greeks distinguished between mutual love (*eros*), or the desire of persons one for another, and pure or sacrificial love (*agape*) as the full sharing of life. The former, erotic love, is not necessarily unclean, because the two basic drives, hunger and love, lie deep in the heart of man as God's creation. Such love seeks to relate life to life from the standpoint of the self for the sake of one's own happiness. David Hume, as a rationalist, argues for the possibilities of the mutual love of all men as members of one family, where all would live in common without regard to property, but he does not see the paradoxical relationship between mutual and sacrificial love and does not realize the reality of sin as corrupting the purity of love.

Individuals can be called to love but not states. Yet Mr. Harold Butler, after his long experience with the League of Nations and the International Labor Organization, said: "More than for any one reason the peace was lost because the policies of the nations were empty of charity toward each other." After the breakdown of the London Conference of foreign secretaries in 1945, instead of an atmosphere of mutual trust and friendly co-operation, there began to appear between the powers attitudes of suspicion, tension, misunderstanding and fear that are often the precursors of hate and frequently recurring wars.

The first three principles of justice, brotherhood, and liberty are imperfect and limited and can only be completed and fully realized through love. Love is the crown and keystone of the otherwise incomplete arch of human existence. It is the ultimate law of man's life. It is the dynamic motivation of all the values, and virtues, and principles of existence. Such love is not the product of cold reason or of prudential morality as David Hume conceived it. Believers love because God first loved them. And the highest spiritual love is only realizable in vital, dynamic, whole religion. By whole religion, we mean that it must be both individual and social, a religion that can form the character of a new man within and motivate the building of a new society without. The two commands to love God and one's neighbor are always co-ordinated at the summit of Hebraic-Christian monotheism. The Hebrews were the bearers of ethical monotheism to the world, and the Judeo-Christian religion became the basis of modern Western civilization. Even modern science was born of monotheism: it would be impossible under the conception of a lawless conflict of the gods of polytheism.

APPLYING THE FOUR CRITERIA TO HISTORY

True religion should not only furnish the motivation and dynamic to live the good life, and to realize justice, brotherhood, and liberty, but should give a vantage point above human life from which we may judge history itself. The Christian religion views time in the light of eternity and the eternal as the source and ground of the temporal. It judges the attainments and failures of each social order against the background of the conception of the Kingdom of God. It finds meaning in history and views the rise and fall of civilizations from the vantage-point of an eternity above history. It finds that all the known facts of history verify the interpretation of human destiny found in the New Testament, where we find the ultimate clue to history. The modern world has wrongly sought redemption by regarding the process of history itself as redemptive. The rationalistic humanist believes that by a little more education, or knowledge, or effort, or by a true philosophy, or a more perfect organization of his individual, national and international life, man can save himself. We shall find in our study, however, that while history is frequently creative, it is never of itself redemptive. We shall find no full realization of meaning or of ultimate achievement in history if we exclude or eliminate God.

In the time of Amos, the people of Israel were willing to worship God but excluded the rights of their fellow men by their selfish greed. Many a modern rationalist and humanist admits his duty to his neighbor, but would eliminate or be completely agnostic to the ethical monotheism that lies at the basis of that duty. But life—like peace—is indivisible. If we would see life steadily and make it whole, we can omit neither love to God nor to man and can ignore no one of the four principles or cornerstones which we believe must lie at the basis of any tolerable or enduring social order. We can build nothing worthy or enduring without the cornerstone of justice; no society that is united, whole, or harmonious that denies the fundamental principle of brotherhood; nothing that is better than a prison, without liberty; and nothing that can hope to attain any worthy goal in history without the love of God and man realized in vital religion.

If we seek to discover the purpose of God in history, we cannot hope to do so from any narrow or bigoted viewpoint, as by an arbitrary division between the religious and the secular life. We must have a wide sense of the possible values of life which may be realized in history and toward which man is working. We must include the Greek values of the true, the beautiful, and the good, as well as the Hebrew values such as righteousness and justice grounded in the ethical and religious life. With Croce we shall even include utility as a value. *We shall recognize in our study throughout this volume the various strands in history, such as the moral and spiritual, the intellectual and esthetic, the political, and the economic.* All these have value and are of major importance in man's quest for happiness and for the good life. For instance, if man's political organization is corrupt and his economic relations utterly unjust, his moral and spiritual as well as his intellectual and esthetic life can never be realized. Therefore we shall recognize values in all these major strands of man's life.

CHAPTER II

GOD IN EVOLUTION: IN NATURE AND HISTORY

WE MUST RAISE the question of the fact, the method, and the results of evolution and ask whether its total trend is toward justice, brotherhood, liberty, and altruistic love. Concerning the fact of evolution, there now seems to be no more doubt in the mind of competent modern scientists regarding it than of the fact of gravitation. Evolution appears to be the divine mode of creation as gravitation is the divine mode of sustentation. If evolution is a fact and God is the supreme reality of the universe, then this means simply the way of God's working. All Christians may start on common ground: "In the beginning, God." They all believe that the world is his and he made it. If we ask whether God made it suddenly or gradually, we must choose between the two theories, almost equally old, of special creation by divine decree and of gradual evolution. Both were held by the ancient Greeks some centuries before Christ. Equally earnest Christians may agree to differ whether the world was created in a moment of time, in six days of twenty-fours each, or through a long and noble process of gradual development.

THE WITNESS OF EVOLUTION

Everywhere in nature, we are in the presence of constant and orderly change, where "nothing is constant but change." In *the inorganic realm* before our very eyes today, we see some of the heaviest of the ninety-two natural elements,[1] such as radium, disintegrating and being transformed into simpler elements; while the spectroscope reveals the reverse process going on in the spiral nebulae and the younger stars which show only a few elements, but which are probably building up all the ninety-two elements, most of which are found in the older stars or suns. The record of the rocks reveals the fashioning of the earth by slow processes in successive strata which contain fossil remains that gradually rose from lower to higher forms of life.

Much clearer than the inorganic is the record of the ordered progress of *organic life* where we see a continuous process apparently advancing from matter through life to consciousness, which finally culminates in man. Here we can trace biological movement, in a definite direction, producing some two hundred and fifty thousand species of backboneless animals and later over twenty-five thousand species of backboned animals, gradually advancing through differentiation and integration to ever higher forms of life, with new species being added right before our eyes. For illustration, in any good museum of natural history, we can see the steady evolution of the horse by placing scores of skeletons in a row. These advance from the little *eohippus,* the first horse, about eleven inches high with five long toes fitted for running in the deep marsh grass, to the swift race horse or heavy draft horse, some sixty-four inches in height or six times the height of the first horse, with the rudiments of five toes now united in a single hoof adapted to its present environment. Or, we could place in a row a similar long line of skeletons of advancing man.

We note in *the development of the individual* that each is produced from a single cell. We can hardly distinguish among the early embryos of a shark, a chicken, and a man. In the early stages all three have gills for breathing under water, required in the earlier stages of life; all have a long tail and a blood circulation peculiar to the fish. Before birth these gradually disappear in the human embryo, which at one stage is covered with a kind of dark fur. There are nearly two hundred vestiges, like the appendix, that are of no use to us at present and even at times are a danger or cause of death, but which once had a functional use in an ancestral form of life. Similar vestiges are found in the now unused hind limbs of the whale and of the python and the thumb of the bird.

---

[1] In our experiments with the atomic bomb we have already discovered at least two new artificially produced elements.

The only theory that fits all the facts is that of gradual development or evolution. All these facts which evidence a costly, agelong process enhance the real dignity of man, which consists not in his biological but in his spiritual origin, —in what he is, and in what he may become rather than in what he was. He is made in the image of God. In the first chapter of Genesis we have the story of creation recorded in a prescientific age from a religious point of view in a noble poem. It pictures the heavens and the earth apparently created out of nothing in six literal days of twenty-four hours each, the earth covered with vegetation before the creation of sun or stars, and a firmament as a solid dome above. Noble as the poem is, it is religious and not scientific. Evolution, on the other hand, has been the master key to unlock the portal to the modern world.

Many scientists would say with Lord Kelvin: "If you think strongly enough you will be forced by science to the belief in God, which is the foundation of all religion." William Jennings Bryan wrote in 1922: "The real question is, did God use evolution as his plan? If it could be shown that man, instead of being made in the image of God, is a development of beasts we would have to accept it."[2] The answer, of course, is that man is both made in the image of God and is the result of a long unbroken line of development.

---

[2] *The New York Times,* Feb. 26, 1922. The State of Tennessee passed laws forbidding in state-supported schools "the teaching that man has descended from a lower order of animals." In June, 1925, a young teacher, Scopes, was prosecuted under the law, found guilty, and fined $100. Since then, several other states have passed similar laws. Each time the writer visits Soviet Russia he is asked whether it is true that such ignorance and superstition still prevail in America.

Upon a broad view, we see evolution consisting in its main trunk, or stem, of one line of unlimited progress among thousands of long-range trends toward specialization, with multitudinous short-range diversifications producing separate species. Frederick Ratzel wrote: "A philosophy of the history of the human race . . . must be charged with the conviction that all existence is one—a single conception sustained from beginning to end upon one identical law." At the base of the tree of life the lower branches are of the vegetable kingdom. Above these are simple protozoa of undifferentiated life, then worms, mollusks, fishes, reptiles, birds, and finally mammals, the erect ape, sub-man, and then man, made at last in the image of God.

Darwin's great book, *The Origin of Species* (1859), included two elements. First, he demonstrated, by a vast wealth of examples, that the current theory of the fixity of species was untenable and that the facts of nature could only be explained by an evolutionary theory. Second, to account for evolution, he proposed the mechanism of natural selection, by which favorable varieties would automatically be accumulated. In the last twenty-five years a flood of new facts regarding evolution and heredity have abundantly confirmed Darwin's first tenet but only in part his second.[3] Recently discovered facts explain the formation of new species in many different ways, through physical isolation on islands, or by genetic isolation, or accident. Birds ceased to improve in their flying some fifteen million years ago; ants ceased to progress perhaps thirty million years ago; while man's progress is continually accelerated owing to his permanent plasticity. Changes which required fifty thousand years in the early Paleolithic age were accomplished in a millennium at its close. Progress that took a century six thousand years ago in Ur is now achieved in less than a decade.

---

[3] See Julian Huxley's *Evolution: The Modern Synthesis,* New York, Harper Brothers, 1942, and *On Living in a Revolution,* New York, Harper Brothers, 1944; and J. B. S. Haldane's *The Causes of Evolution,* New York, Harper Brothers, 1932. Darwin's principles have been more modified in detail than Newton's, yet there is less likelihood of their being superseded. Though Newtonian physics were the most effective first approximation to physical truth, some of their fundamental principles have now been superseded. After Newton, God through evolution produces Einstein, and after Einstein there will be other discoverers of new truth.

Darwin's distinctive second tenet has not been confirmed, that all the innumerable forms of life came about by means of slight *accidental* variations under the influence of "natural selection" resulting in "the survival of the fittest."[4] This view was for awhile made popular through Haeckel's championship of it in the frank interests of atheism. Many eagerly embraced a theory that left God out of creation and evolution and history. Nietzsche and the Nazis were eager to believe that God was "dead" and that there was no moral order in the universe. Supermen or Nazi gangsters could seek to conquer the world and impose upon it their own will, their own morality or immorality.

Like the existence of God, or the idea that God is at work in history, while it is not subject to rational demonstration, nevertheless the evolution idea is a master key which opens every lock into which it can fit. We do not know of a single biological or spiritual fact that contradicts it. We see a rational universe, not a multiverse; a law-abiding cosmos, not a chaos. Everywhere we see adaptation, the adaptation of nature to knowledge, of things to thought, of matter to mind. The whole universe looks like the unfolding of one vast plan and purpose of Mind. With the exception of the problem of evil, with which we shall deal later, it looks like God's world. And God is the only key that fits all the locks of the universe.

---

[4] Alfred Russell Wallace, the co-discoverer with Darwin of evolutionary development, maintained in his *World of Life* that the "tendency to vary," which Darwin took as a simple experimental fact, has a nonmaterial cause. He deduced two great conclusions: that the general tendency of evolution from good to better is not accidental but purposive; and that human evolution is the development of a spiritual being fit to survive bodily death. Thus evolution, like man himself, cannot be maintained on a purely physical plane. It begins and ends with the spiritual. It begins in God and ends in man, made in the image of God.

Hegel's whole system was the unfolding of a logical, cosmic, and theistic evolution and that is exactly what our universe seems to be. Sir James Jeans sees the universe not as dead matter, nor as a lifeless machine, but as a living thought, an expression of Mind. He says: "There is no need even to worry overmuch about apparent contradictions. The higher unity of ultimate reality must no doubt reconcile them all. We discover that the universe shows evidence of a designing or controlling power that has something in common with our own individual minds."[5] And again he says: "As inhabitants of earth, we are living at the very beginning of time. . . . By what light we have, we seem to discern that the main message of astronomy is one of hope to the race and of responsibility to the individual—of responsibility because we are drawing plans and laying foundations for a longer future than we can well imagine."[6]

The evolutionary development of the individual is like a condensed recapitulation of the evolution of the race, and the whole of nature seems to have come to be what it is by a continuous natural process. Jesus said, "As my Father has continued working to this hour, so I work too." As fellow workers with God in some small measure we also may dare to continue God's unfolding purpose in incomplete emergent evolution. If man is the climax of creation, it would seem that on him rests the responsibility to carry on the great purpose of God—with him and by his grace, but not without him. Evolution gives the world of animate nature a new unity. It is a moving picture or a sublime drama of the advancement of life by continuous natural stages, without haste, yet without rest. Throughout the whole drama, there has been not only increase in complexity, but the growing dominance of mind in life. The process seems to rise from the material to the rational, moral, and spiritual, and finally to God whom we believe to be the source and end of emergent evolution.[7]

---

[5] Sir James Jeans, *The Mysterious Universe,* New York, Macmillan, 1944, pp. 148-149, 330.

[6] Sir James Jeans, *The Universe Around Us,* New York, Macmillan, 1944, p. 343.

If we define progress, whether in individuals or species, as the avoidance of dead ends, which are so frequent in evolution, and the capacity for unlimited further advance, we find that the net result of evolutionary progress is in raising the upper level attained by life in greater control, greater independence, greater harmony of construction, and for man, greater capacity for knowledge and growing appreciation of the higher values of life. Successive steps have led to new dominant types: a combination of cells to form a multicellular individual, the evolution of a body and then of a head, the development of lungs, of warm blood, and finally the enhancement of intelligence by speech. Man is standing today at the culmination of "a thousand-million-year" sweep of biological progress through inorganic, organic, and spiritual evolution. The highest product of the cosmic process is the developed human personality. With human consciousness, values and ideals were first recognized on earth. Only the vertebrates were eligible as agents for unlimited progress, for only they were able to achieve the combination of active efficiency, size, and terrestrial existence on which the later stages of progress were of necessity based. Birds were ruled out of the main stream of progress for they were deprived of potential hands in favor of actual wings. The lion and tiger were armored against progress by the very efficiency of their limbs and teeth: only the meek could inherit the earth. It was necessary for the anthropoid to descend from the trees and take an erect posture before he could become man. This meant the final liberation of the hand,

---

[7] As C. Lloyd Morgan says: "There is nothing in emergent evolution which purports to be strictly naturalistic, that precludes an acknowledgment of God." And again, "I acknowledge God as the nisus through whose activity emergents arise and the whole course of emergent evolution is directed." Morgan sees nothing in emergent evolution incompatible with God, immanent and transcendent, or even with the Incarnation of God in Christ.

C. Lloyd Morgan, *Emergent Evolution,* New York, Henry Holt, 1922, pp. 2, 31, 36, 209.

and also placed the evolving creature in a more varied and stimulating environment in which a higher premium was placed upon intelligence. The last step taken in evolutionary advance and the only one to hold out the promise of unlimited progress in the evolutionary future was the degree of intelligence which evolved true speech and conceptual thought.

The bypaths of evolution appear as a series of blind alleys. Only along one single line is progress and its future possibility now being continued—the line of man. It is ten or twenty million years since man's ancestors branched off from the anthropoids which were forced into lines of specialization from which a conscious, thinking creature could not develop. As Huxley shows, after a thousand million years of evolution, progress now hangs on but a single thread—the human germ plasm. Man alone, in all the universe, is not finished. Though within nature, he transcends it. He must find the right clue to both nature and history if he is to realize their meaning and their possible ends. He must find God immanent in nature, and God, transcendent and immanent, working in human history. If he loses God, the alpha and omega, the source and end of evolution, he is, like the apes, in a blind alley. He has lost contact with the center and source of all his life and of that of the universe.

The realization of values now becomes the main avenue of progress, chiefly along the lines of our four principles. The thousand-million-year sweep of evolution includes the present world social revolution on our tiny planet as one moment, or part, of the stream of progress that marks the work of God both in nature and history. Evolution is only slow revolution, and revolution accelerated evolution. God is in both. He is working slowly over the millenniums in inorganic and organic evolution. He is working more rapidly in human evolution and revolution, though thwarted by man's freedom and blindness in his pride, selfishness, and sin. The man of faith may rise to the recognition of the fact that he may be a conscious "fellow worker with God." To a limited extent, man can consciously co-operate with God in the process of evolution, as did Luther Burbank and other breeders of plants, animals, and men. To an almost unlimited extent, man may be a fellow worker with God in his spiritual kingdom and in the development and reformation of human cultures and civilizations. May not the first step toward becoming a conscious fellow worker in the divine intention be to see that God is indeed working in both nature and in history and then to live one's own life to the uttermost in seeking to do God's will in justice, brotherhood, liberty and vital religion expressed in the love of God and man?

THE WITNESS OF EDUCATION

We have tried briefly to trace God working in nature in the whole majestic sweep of the process of evolution, and we may now observe him working in the education of man. The earth has been prepared for man's habitation over a vast period estimated at from 400,000,000 to 1,600,000,000 years, and more than half of geological time had passed before life had developed on the planet.[8] Toward the end of this period, four glacial ages had prepared the earth, marking time by the swing of the pendulum of the giant ice clock as the ice-cap advanced and retreated, forcing man to advance upon his long and painful pilgrimage, and educating him in hardship. The oyster might sleep, but man never. The life man inherited from the lower orders had the characteristics of the power of growth, it required nourishment, it could move, and reproduce itself and it was always characterized by sensitivity. Pain was its danger signal, and suffering life's chief means of education. The oyster and crab in their shells were safe—and doomed. Throughout his history, man must suffer and grow. Hunger and love were the major drives in man's agelong process of education.

---

[8] Among the authorities consulted on this section were: *The Cambridge Ancient History,* Volume I, 1928; H. G. Wells, *Outline of History,* 1920; H. F. Osborn, *Men of the Old Stone Age,* 1916; W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity,* 1940; G. G. MacCurdy, *Human Origins,* 1926; H. F. Cleland, *Our Prehistoric Ancestors,* 1928; A. A. Trever, *History of Ancient Civilization,* 1936; and Julian Huxley's *Evolution: The Modern Synthesis,* 1942.

Branching from the main stem of the great tree of evolution among the higher mammals was the walking ape-man (Pithecanthropus erectus), the remains of which were found in Java. Over half a million years ago, there were sub-men, or hominids, in Asia as represented by the "Peking Man" (Sinanthropus Pekinensis), the remains of which were found in a cave near Peking in 1927. These bones are older than any other human remains known upon the planet. A number of human skulls were discovered in close proximity to numerous stone, bone, and horn implements, together with the fossils of many animals, some of them now extinct, which probably belonged to the Old Stone Age some five hundred thousand years ago.[9] Many believe this Peking man was the direct ancestor of the Mongolian race, which perhaps peopled eastern Asia and furnished the progenitors of the Indian population of North and South America, including the builders of the high civilizations of early Mexico and Peru. At this period these sub-men were ranging over Europe, Asia, and North Africa. Later than the Peking man the Neanderthal man appeared, the remains of which were first found in Neanderthal, near Düsseldorf, Germany. He was a passable human being, chinless, not quite erect and perhaps incapable of speech. This Neanderthal man was not easily educable, not fully fitted to survive, and he became entirely extinct, leaving behind only a few flint instruments. Then, the first cousin of the Neanderthalers, the Cro-Magnon man arose, flourished for a time, and passed away in spite of his tall stature and astonishingly big brain. We do not know where or why he failed, but for some reason he was not fit to survive. Then *Homo sapiens* appeared upon the scene as the crown, the summit, the end product of the main trunk and central stem of the evolutionary tree. We are not yet certain whether man emerged from a single or multiple origin.

---

[9] The complete cranium of this primal man and fragments of the bones of twenty-five other individuals were discovered. Some scientists believe that this early man was a younger brother of the erect ape man of Java and an elder brother of the Piltdown man of England. This primitive Peking man used fire, tools, and articulate speech; and he had several characteristics in common with modern Chinese in eastern Asia. His brain capacity (850 to 1,220 cc.) was twice that of the gorilla and a little less than modern man (average, 1,350 cc.).

The Creator of these first men had to begin the long and painful process of their education as they were led to discover the use of fire, of human speech, simple stone and wooden implements, tools, and weapons. Primitive man had to struggle to survive; he had to hunt and work to gain his livelihood; he had to use his hands and control his body and later to develop his brain. Early man had to take the world as he found it. His only struggle was for survival. As primitive man advanced in his education, he invented tools and instruments to satisfy his desire and to improve his environment. As he came to understand his surroundings and something of himself, he found at last that he had the amazing capacity of so altering his environment that he could finally build a new world. Though driven from his original garden or jungle to the desert, he could in time make that desert blossom as the rose. That was part of his higher education.

Primitive men were partly dressed in skins in cold regions, and they were prevailingly right-handed as shown by the fact that the left side of their brain, which serves the right side of the body, was bigger than their right. Their brains were as large as ours, but while the back parts of the brain, which dealt with sight and touch and the control of the body, were well developed, the front parts, which are connected with thought and speech, were relatively small. Primitive man was educated by his strivings for a constant food supply, for protection against danger, for shelter and for mating—but always by his enforced strivings. Few grew to maturity in those stark days, and all Europe was populated only by several thousand primitive men. Not many attained to an age of forty. Man's later education was advanced by his social life, by the *mores* or customs and severe restraints of the tribe. In isolation, the individual could learn little, and alone he could not even survive. From the first, man was a social animal. His progress at all times, however, was retarded by the restraints of tradition. Education was chiefly imitation. The hand-ax was used for tens of thousands of years in contrast to the thousands of patents taken out annually in a modern industrial nation.

As primitive society developed, the family became at last the chief means of man's education and of character building. The words father, mother, brother, and sister finally became the most important in his developing vocabulary. Early man's education was promoted also by his work, first in the use of his hands and later in the use of his brain in growing ingenuity. He hunted for his food, but in the early stages of his struggle for life, he was the hunted rather than the hunter. Early man was both herbivorous and carnivorous. Some early men could draw astonishingly well and they were inveterate painters in black, brown, red, yellow, and white pigments, leaving their splendid achievements for us to this day in the caves of France and Spain. They began very early to sing and to dance. With infinite pains they made flint and stone implements of great beauty. Primitive man produced at first no pottery, no cooking implements, no buildings, and there was no cultivation of grain or vegetables.

For some two hundred centuries, or ten times the length of the Christian era, naked, painted savages—except for a fur wrap in cold weather—roved over the open plains of Europe, Asia, and North Africa, when the desert of Sahara was a tropical jungle full of game. The old world was the nursery of the sub-races of mankind, but man was fully man when he entered the new world of the Americas. Finally, the struggle for food led to the invention of agriculture and ushered in the Neolithic, the greatest of all ages in man's upward progress from savagery. An enormous advance was thus made in man's education by the cultivation of grain and by the use of plants and seeds. If agriculture was first invented or developed in irrigable regions, the valleys of the Euphrates and the Nile, the Yellow River in China, and the river regions in Peru in South America made possible the birth of early civilizations. In regions dependent on irrigation, in order to calculate and prepare for the rise of the rivers in the rainy season, the invention of the calendar later became necessary in man's further education.

When man slowly learned to sow that he might reap, the first sowings were perhaps connected with the burial of grain with a human being, and later sowing was accompanied by sacrifices, often human sacrifices, at seed time. From the earliest times the practices of religion absorbed almost the whole of man's concrete existence, binding men together mentally and emotionally in common life and action. Primitive religion meant the consecration of life, the stimulation of the will to live and do. Sir E. B. Tylor in *Primitive Culture* proposes as a minimum definition of religion, "the belief in spiritual beings," while Sir J. G. Fraser in *The Golden Bough* understands by religion, "a propitiation or conciliation of powers superior to man which are believed to direct and control the course of nature and of human life." Primitive men began to discover God, at first in animistic or polytheistic forms, and men ever since have had to make this great discovery of God for themselves. Religion was first a social function of the entire tribe and only later developed in individual experience. The social message of Amos came a century and a half before the development of personal religion in Jeremiah. More than a hundred thousand years ago, men began to bury their dead with solemn ceremonies, and very early in the hope of a future life.

Neolithic man had domesticated cattle, sheep, goats, and pigs. The hunter had turned herdsman and finally primitive farmer. One invention led to another. In place of skins for clothing, man's active mind suggested cloth made from wool or vegetable fibres, and then he invented the loom. When man learned to control fire, he could make pottery and finally invented a method of smelting ores. An alloy of copper with tin made bronze possible, with new weapons and instruments that ushered in, after the age of stone, the ages of bronze and then of iron. Gold was the first known of the metals, then copper and bronze. More than three thousand years ago in Europe, and earlier in Asia, men began to smelt iron and the iron age introduced a gradual revolution which increased the tempo of progress. The desire for copper, bronze, and amber led to trade and thus to intercourse with other people that carried man beyond his habitual danger of stagnant and selfish isolation. The trader brought not only new wares, tools, and ornaments, but new ideas, and man for the first time in history began to desire to be cosmopolitan. Trade, and much later business and industry, became man's educator. The animal lived by instinct but every activity of man's arduous life served to educate him.

A constant food supply also gave man leisure which became a stimulus to progress and a means of education for man's lagging brain. Leisure led to the development of his artistic life. Living in permanent houses in communities developed social life and made government necessary, and kingship came into being. For man as a political animal government advanced over slow millenniums from the rule of one, to the few, to the many, and then finally to all, wherever there is representative government by majorities.

Nearly all the greatest inventions, like speech, fire, and the use of tools, were achieved by our prehistoric ancestors. Nevertheless our modern inventions—printing, the steam engine, electricity and its manifold applications, the telegraph, telephone, wireless, radio, and all modern means of communication, transportation and industry—have increased man's ability to secure greater results from his labor. They have provided better food, clothing, housing and health, and more leisure. They have increased man's amusements and his pleasure and made possible the development of his intellectual and esthetic life. They have increased the quantity and complexity of his civilization, but not necessarily the quality of his culture. As we study man's later materialistic history, we are forced to ask what it shall profit him if he gains the whole world but loses his own soul? We are compelled to retrace our steps to study the moral and spiritual aspects of man's life that must furnish the heart of his intellectual, esthetic, economic, political, and social life. Otherwise man fails to discover the central and final secret of education; he is unable to save his disintegrating civilization and build a better world.

Thought developed very late in man's life, and language became the instrument of thought, as the hand of the mind. Primitive man—though adapted to his physical environment—lived on the mental level of a modern child of four or five. When we deal with the education of man, we include, with John Stuart Mill, everything that "helps to shape the human being." Society educates the individual and man's advancing religion enhances the value of human personality. Education becomes an attempt on the part of the adult members of society to shape the development of the coming generation in accordance with the older generation's ideas of life. This tends to make education conservative rather than progressive and to perpetuate the limitations and prejudices of older generations. Such conservatism makes it difficult, for instance, for feudal teachers to train for a new democracy, or for the beneficiaries of a capitalistic economic order to prepare youth for a socialized or planned economy.

Even in the experience of primitive man in his early education, the struggle for life was gradually supplemented by the struggle for the life of others, originating in the sacrifice of the mother for her child. The necessity of self-suppression was early experienced as men entered upon the long and arduous path towards a life for the common good. The education of every epoch partakes of the evils of its social order. It is only the rare and prepared prophet who conceives and then envisions and communicates the new truth for the new day. True education must both learn from the past and create the future. The Roman historian, Livy, wrote in his *Preface:*

> The study of history is particularly salutary and fruitful because in it you can see, in a brilliant record, illustrations of every possible type, and from it you can take, for yourself and your state, examples to imitate and others, disgraceful in their origin and issue, to avoid.

Long before Livy, however, the Hebrew prophets felt there were lessons to be learned from history because they were sure that God was in history and that he had a great purpose for man. Following them, the writers of the New Testament, in speaking of the events of Jewish history, could say with the Apostle Paul: "It all happened to them by way of warning for others, and it was written down for the purpose of instructing us whose lot has been cast in the closing hours of the world" (I Cor. 10[11]). Thus the Old and New Testaments describe the uses of history. Every writer of both Testaments is convinced that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." True education must finally furnish man not merely with tools but with a sense of values and a store of ideals. These are acquired, as Sir Richard Livingstone shows in writing *On Education,*[10] by living with the best things in the world—the best human beings and the best social orders which most incorporate justice, brotherhood, liberty, and love, or loyalty to vital religion. Sir Richard is convinced that God is indeed in human history and in the whole process of man's slowly advancing education. We simply cannot find the purpose of education, the meaning of life or of history if we leave God out. Herder saw all history as the education of the human race. In this process of human education, evolution is not only the forming of organisms by the environment, but the transformation of environments by organisms—by man as a fellow worker with

---

[10] Sir Richard Livingstone, *On Education,* Toronto, Macmillan, 1944, II, p. 54.

God. Viewing the whole sweep of evolution in the long upward struggle of life from the amoeba to Einstein, nature is seen as the living garment of God, and history as the divine tapestry both made and marred through man.

Education is the liberation of intelligence for the improvement of human life. It is a lifelong conquest. In this life at least—and probably in the life beyond—it never ceases. For education is the continuous refashioning of life in its adaptation to an ever-changing environment, in accordance with ever nobler patterns. Every man must learn to live by living *now*. The educated man must learn to read, to study, and to think. Twenty-three centuries after Socrates, we are without excuse if we do not learn the meaning of education as thought. All true education likewise implies growth —growth in the various dimensions of life, on the physical and material plane, in intellectual breadth, in spiritual depth. True education also includes culture. As the embryo of the individual recapitulates the evolution of the race, the truly educated man has the privilege of restudying and sharing in the education of all humanity. As we begin now to trace the mid-current of history that produced our Western civilization, it is the privilege of the individual to learn the major lessons acquired in the rise of Sumerian civilization in Ur, in "the dawn of conscience" in Egypt, in the ethical monotheism of the Hebrews, in our rich Hellenic heritage, and in the Roman synthesis that prepared the way for our realization of "one world" on our war-threatened planet.

CHAPTER III

GOD IN THE MID-CURRENT OF HISTORY

IT MAY SEEM PRESUMPTUOUS to speak of any "mid-current" in history when it is relative only to our Western civilization. We do not, of course, disparage Oriental cultures, especially the high attainments of China and India. When our ancestors were barbarians, clad in skins in central Europe, the gentry of China were clothed in silks and were producing a great literature, and later the Brahmans of India were writing the philosophy of the Upanishads. The Orient not only realized high intellectual and spiritual values, but avoided many of the barbarities of materialistic Western civilization. Pantheistic Hindus believed, however, that all history was sheer illusion, having no more permanent significance than the ever-changing cloud forms in the sky.[1] We welcome the priceless contributions that the Orient has made and will yet make to the world's best life. We are dealing in this chapter, however, with the mid-current that produced progressive Western civilization, and which explains the underlying unity that subsists between all the nations of the West.

There are half a dozen races likes the Eskimo that have suffered from arrested development. Though well adapted to their environment, their life today is what it was six thousand years ago. During all that period, they have made no advance toward civilization and have not produced what we would call a single great man. From the point of view of progress, they lie in the stagnant backwaters outside the stream of civilization. As we examine the sources of Western cultures, we find that there were certain nations and peoples who formed the mid-current of the flowing stream that produced our civilization. Brevity will compel us to limit ourselves to five chief sources of our Western cultures and civilizations: the Sumerians of Ur and the later Babylonians, the Egyptians, the Hebrews, the Greeks, and the Romans. Of these the two chief influences which molded the West were the Hebraic and the Hellenic. We must begin, however, with the high civilization of Ur before 4000 B.C., two millenniums before the traditional date of Abraham and three millenniums before it was called "Ur of the Chaldees," when the Chaldeans entered southern Babylonia from the Persian Gulf only about 1000 B.C.

---

[1] It lies beyond the scope of this book to point out why Oriental cultures remained often static and ineffective, lacking the power to embody the values in their own systems. Our four principles, as a criterion of judgment, might be applied to the Orient as well as to the Occident.

1. The Sumerian Civilization of Ur

We can trace the birth of the first high city civilization back to Ur in Lower Mesopotamia. Sir Arthur Keith describes the excavations at Ur under Sir Leonard Wooley of the royal graves of the First Dynasty about 3500 B.C., the evidences of a general flood on the lower Euphrates about 4000 B.C., and a prediluvian city of Ur near the beginning of the fifth millennium B.C.[2]

The city civilization of Ur was far older than the First Dynasty in Egypt. The Sumerians were a dark-haired white race of Indo-European stock, resembling ourselves or perhaps modern Arabs in appearance. The Sumerians had a cranial capacity (1488 c.c.) larger than the Egyptians and about the same size as modern Englishmen or Americans. They developed advanced agricultural methods through irrigation, with bumper crops of barley, which, with silver shekels, furnished the medium of exchange before coins were known. Far in advance of Egypt, they worked skilfully in metals, in copper, gold, silver, and electrum. They were innovators in architecture, being masters of the vault, the arch, and the dome. Their fine sculptures, exquisite jewelry, and musical instruments reveal their appreciation of beauty both of line and color. The writer was moved as he gazed upon the finely wrought gold crown of the king, the jewelry and headdress of the Queen Shub-ad, a beautiful gold dagger, and all the contents of a grave dated about 3500 B.C., or fifteen hundred years before the traditional date of Abraham.[3]

---

[2] Sir Arthur Keith, *New Discoveries Relating to the Antiquity of Man,* New York, W. W. Norton, 1931, p. 238. These excavations were made by a joint expedition fitted out by the British Museum and the University of Pennsylvania from 1919 to 1925. On the surface, Wooley found a temple built by Nebuchadnezzar at Ur about 600 B.C. Below this were graves from the time of Sargon, the Semitic ruler of Sumer and Accad (2700-2600 B.C.) . Still deeper "the most awe-inspiring graves" dug about 3500 B.C. where the court in full regalia marched to be buried with the dead monarch. Below these was an eight-foot deposit of mud, the evidence of a widespread flood, and still below, evidences of a great city of Ur near the beginning of the 5th millennium B.C." Recent excavations 400 miles north of Ur have revealed a simple agricultural civilization of Ubaid of farmers, builders, and craftsmen that goes back to some 6000 B.C. but it never approached the high, opulent, city civilization of Ur.

By 3500 B.C., Sumerian art had reached a level seldom attained in the ancient world. Professor W. F. Albright maintains that "for at least a thousand years Sumerian was the sole written language of Mesopotamia (3500-2500 B.C.) and for some 2,500 years more it remained the learned tongue of western Asia, being at one time taught in the schools of Syria (c. 1400 B.C.) and Asia Minor."[4]

About 2000 B.C., scribes and historians began to record the glories of the preceding dynasties from a great mass of documents dating from about 3000 to 1600 B.C. The Sumerians were great traders. Their wealth was based upon agriculture, home manufactures, and foreign trade from the Persian Gulf and the eastern Mediterranean. They were held together by force and a high civilization. They built an empire because of their superior weapons, army, and intelligence. They had no large professional army; every citizen was a public servant and all were liable to the draft.

---

[3] Sir Leonard Wooley, *Ur of the Chaldees,* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929, pp. 33-62, and *The Sumerians,* 1928, pp. 21-26. The writer journeyed to Carchemish to see Major Wooley's excavations there and discussed with him the significance of his discoveries at Ur.

[4] W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity,* Baltimore, Johns Hopkins, 1940, p. 9. Sumero-Accadian cuneiform is our eariest known writing. It was used to write many other languages and occasionally Indo-Iranian, Hebrew, Egyptian and Aramaic. Old Persian and North Canaanite both used cuneiform wedge-shaped characters.

Religion was the dominant center of Sumerian life. It was polytheistic and there are preserved over five thousand names of its pantheon. Each city had its supreme god, that of Ur being Nannar the moon god, with his wife, the moon-goddess Ningal. Some gods were counted terrifyingly aloof, yet others were close to men. The temples were houses of the gods where they hungrily ate the sacrificial meals and were supposed to marry human women and have children by them. In contrast to the other-worldly Egyptians, whose center of gravity was in the life to come, the Sumerians were worldly and practical.

Closer than the great god of the city, each man had his tutelary household god as a mediator and a protector. The Sumerian religion had its stories of Creation and the Flood, which were passed on to the Baylonians and later to the Hebrews, but these myths lacked the moral content of the later stories in Genesis. In the Sumerian legend of the Flood, the gods were angry and decided to destroy the human race by drowning, but the Sumerian Noah built a vessel like the ark. When the ark finally landed on Mount Nitsir, the Noah of Ur and Babylon sent out first a dove, then a swallow, then a crow, which did not return. The Sumerian account of the Flood has no particular moral. As the Sumerians were originally a hill people, they erected their great temple, or ziggurat, at Ur as an artificial mountain with trees upon its high terraces, calling it "the Mountain of God." They desired to worship as the later Hebrews, "on high places and on every high hill." The most famous ziggurat was that of Babylon, called the "tower of Babel" in Hebrew legend (Gen. 11[1-9]). Though that in Babylon has been entirely destroyed, the similar ziggurat at Ur is the best preserved in all Mesopotamia. Next to the great pyramids of Egypt, the mighty ziggurat at Ur was the most impressive ruin ever visited by the author. He will never forget the scene in climbing this mountainous ruin at midnight by the light of the full moon, as he pictured the vast throngs of priests and worshipers of Ur, who ascended these three great causeways more than four thousand years ago. Though in no monotheistic sense, men called their moon god "father" long before the time of Abraham.

Professor S. Langdon of Oxford has traced the influence of the Sumerian religion and culture upon the whole history of western Asia down to our own day. Sumerian influence was continued in the Jewish calendar and the Jewish Sabbath of our time. We can trace the influence of the myths of the Sumerian months from as early as 3000 B.C. through the Babylonian religion to Judaism and its series of fixed festivals, and even to some practices of Christianity in our own times. The Sumerians began the day at sunset and they were followed in this practice by the Babylonians, the Hebrews, and the Greeks. The Jewish month Nisan was derived from the Sumerian "first month" which was called the "month of the sacrificer."[5] The Hebrews adopted the Babylonian plan of a day of rest and the word Sabbath. The great festival of Nisan in the Jewish calendar, together with the offering of the first fruits and the first born of the herds, was fixed by Ezekiel on the fourteenth of this month, and according to Professor Langdon of Oxford, Ezekiel "almost certainly obtained the date of the Passover directly from the Babylonian Church year-books."

Resembling the medieval monasteries of Europe, the temples of Sumeria were the centers of education. Both boys and girls were trained in the profession of the scribe. The writing of cuneiform with its hundreds of wedge-shaped signs was a high art. In Sumeria as a commercial country, the law required that virtually every transaction of life had to be recorded and large numbers of scribes and private citizens could read. We have their clay school tablets, used as slates, still preserved after five thousand years. They studied grammar, arithmetic, the extraction of square and cube roots, and applied geometry, and we have dictionaries with Sumerian and Semitic synonyms in parallel columns. Some were engaged in original research, others as doctors, surgeons, and architects who left us their plans. They left us also a map of their known world to illustrate the conquests of Sargon of Akkad about 2700 B.C.

---

[5] S. Langdon, *Babylonian Menologies,* Oxford Press, 1935, pp. vi, 73, 96, 156.

The chief blot upon Sumerian social life was slavery and upon Sumerian religion, temple prostitution. Attached to every temple was a body of women who formed part of the gods' household, and prostitution was a religious rite. The legitimate first wife of the god was often a king's daughter and if she should commit an act so unseemly as to enter a wine shop, the penalty under the law was death by burning. The dedicated priestesses lived in convents as a sisterhood, as they have done in India throughout the centuries, and there were lower orders of temple prostitutes. This pernicious custom of temple prostitution was passed on to Semitic peoples in the worship of the Baals and was a curse against which the prophets fought fiercely for centuries to establish a high ethical monotheism in Israel (Deut. $23^{17,18}$; Hosea 1^{2}, 3^{1-3}).

The Sumerians had gained their position through moral and cultural supremacy, but the virile Semites of Mesopotamia finally rose in revolt against them: "Ur was smitten with weapons," its king carried away captive, its temple looted, its patron moon god was discredited, and the great buildings of the Third Dynasty of Ur wantonly destroyed. Though the Sumerians passed away as completely as the Ten Tribes of Israel did later, they formed the head-waters of the mid-current of Western civilization. They left us the history and art of a people that died out nearly four thousand years ago so completely, that three generations ago the very existence of the Sumerians was unknown to the scientific world. Recent excavations so recovered their history and achievements that we can now trace many of the lines of influence by which they enriched the cultures and civilizations of the Western world.

When the new culture of King Menes of the First Dynasty in Egypt arose, the civilization of Ur was already old and on a far higher cultural level than that of Egypt. An infusian of foreign models, foreign blood, and foreign culture was introduced into Egypt from Ur and southern Mesopotamia and carried to a higher level by the Egyptians and later by the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans. *The culture and civilization of Ur were never lost.* Not only were Sumerian arms and commerce carried abroad, but the old laws of Sumeria became the code of Babylon. The Sumerian civilization persisted for nearly fifteen hundred years after its people perished. The Hittites of Asia Minor adopted the cuneiform script which was the greatest Sumerian invention. Babylonian became the diplomatic language of Syria and even of Egypt, but the heart of Babylon's culture was derived from Ur. Through the peoples of the Near East, we can trace Sumerian influence on the material civilization of the modern world. The arch in building was unknown in Europe till the conquests of Alexander (356-323 B.C.), but the earliest known arches are found in Sumeria about 3000 B.C.

Sumerian influence in Babylonia reached the Jews in the captivity and Sir Leonard Wooley claims that many of the laws of Moses were based on earlier Sumerian codes: "Their civilization, lighting up a world still plunged in primitive barbarism, was in the nature of a first cause."[6] All that we have said covers only a portion of the influence of these great creative people, who, as our spiritual forebears, lie near the head-waters of our civilization. We can no longer trace all the arts to Greece and think that Hellas sprang, like Pallas, full grown from the brain of the Olympian Zeus. We find in Sumeria the first states and empires, the first organized irrigation, the first use of gold and silver as standards of value, the first business contracts, the first credit system, the first code of law, the first extensive development of writing, the first stories of Creation and the Flood, the first libraries and schools, the first literature and poetry, the first cosmetics and highly artistic jewelry, the first sculpture and bas-relief, the first palaces and temples, the first ornamental metal and interior decoration, the first arch, column, vault, and dome in architecture. Here for the first time appear also some of the vices of civilization: slavery, despotism, ecclesiasticism, imperialistic war, temple prostitution, the first comfort and luxury for the rich and hard disciplined labor for the enslaved poor.[7]

---

[6] Sir Leonard Wooley, *The Sumerians,* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928, p. 193.

The Semites followed the Sumerians into southern Mesopotamia and formed the virile minority of the population there. They assimilated the higher Sumerian culture, finally conquered the Sumerians, formed an empire of their own under Sargon of Akkad, and then widely diffused Sumerian culture. Hammurabi, the greatest king of a later dynasty (2130-2088 B.C.), gave to Babylonia the famous code of laws which bears strange resemblances to the early Book of the Covenant (Ex. 20^{22}-23^{33}). Hammurabi's code reflects the life of a highly organized commercial community with an advanced civilization superior in social, political, and intellectual matters to the simple pastoral Hebrews of Palestine. These simple Hebrews in their developing moral and religious life, however, went far beyond the Sumerians, Babylonians, Egyptians, and all other peoples, and furnished the moral vertebra of Western civilization. Hammurabi had collected all the best laws from old Sumerian times to his own, combined them into a great code in the Semitic speech and had them engraved on splendid shafts of stone. Women engaged in business on their own account and some attended school and became scribes. Later came the vigorous Aramaean migration into Mesopotamia of which Terah's journey from Ur to Haran formed a part.

---

[7] Will Durant, *The Story of Civilization,* New York, Simon and Schuster, 1944, Vol. II, p. 134.

THE STORY OF ABRAHAM

> Terah took Abram his son, and Lot his grandson, and Sarai his daughter-in-law, the wife of his son Abram, and led them from Chaldean Ur to reach the land of Canaan. But when they reached Haran Terah died. . . . Said the Eternal to Abram, "Leave your country, leave your kindred, leave your father's house, for a land that I will show you; I will make a great nation of you." (Gen. 11^{31}–12^{2}).

The Old Testament categorically repeats the statement several times that Abraham came from Ur. As the traditional founder and begetter of the Hebrew race three of the world's great religions—the Jewish, the Christian, and the Moslem—look upon him as one of the chief prophets and witnesses to man's faith in the God of history. He alone is called the "Friend of God" (II Chron. 20^{7}; James 2^{23}). Sir Leonard Wooley in his *Abraham* endeavors "to show that quite apart from the general credibility of the oral tradition there are good grounds for believing that the fact of Abraham's existence was vouched for by written documents almost if not quite contemporary with him."[8]

The present ruins show that the prosperous citizens of Ur built themselves comfortable two-storied brick homes containing from ten to twenty rooms each, with rich oriental furniture and beautiful rugs and carpets. In many of these homes, there was a private chapel. Before the time of Abraham they began the custom of burying their dead, not as previously in huge cemeteries, but in sealed brick vaults below the family chapel. About 2000 B.C., we have records of the Habiru, or Hebrew, people, probably a numerous tribe that had migrated into southern Mesopotamia. Sir Leonard Wooley believes the story of Abraham fits in with the actual historical situation if Abraham's sojourn in Ur was during the reign of King Rim-Sin who was finally overthrown by Hammurabi (c. 2000-1900 B.C.). The traditional journey of Terah and Abraham from Ur to Haran corresponds with a general northward transfer of the Hebrew Semites from southern Babylonia. From thousands of clay tablets surviving from the time of Abraham in Ur, we know much of what the city of Ur was like.

---

[8] This entire section states the findings and views of Sir Leonard Wooley in his *Abraham*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

In the Biblical account: "There was a migration from the east, and men came upon a plain in the land of Shinar [Babylonia] . . . building a city and a tower [ziggurat] whose top reaches to heaven." [Nimrod's] "empire at first was Babylon . . . from which he pushed out into Assyria building the great city of Nineveh." (Gen. 10^{10}). The oral tradition regarding Abraham was not committed to writing until after the founding of the Davidic kingdom, probably about 850 B.C.

The local color of the Abraham stories is consistent with what we know of conditions in Ur and in Palestine at the time. We saw that Ur was the city of Nannar, the moon-god, whose great Ziggurat, or "tower of Babel," built of solid brick, already old in Abraham's day, rose in majesty above the city. It was called by its worshippers Heaven, or "the Mountain of God." The temple was like a great monastery in the Middle Ages; the priests were judges, the temple was a court of law, and the seat of a great school. There were hundreds of little public chapels of the minor gods throughout the city and there were the intimate household gods of each family. Ur itself was a cosmopolitan city of from a quarter of a million to half a million souls, and the Sumerian empire had an elaborate postal system.[9]

The city was famous for its textiles and factories, its splendid public buildings, its crowded streets, its quays thronged with shipping. Women were recognized in Sumerian law as individuals and citizens and even the slave could appeal to the courts. But two hundred and fifty years before, in 2170 B.C., Susa had risen in revolt, warlike Semites had captured the city, taken away the king with the cult statue of the moon-god Nannar, and then rebuilt the city of

---

[9] *Ibid.* p. 118.

Ur, now subject to foreign rule. A social and political revolution had swept over Ur which had been supplanted by the lusty young city of Babylon.

Many of the Semites were moving north to secure better conditions as subjects of Hammurabi. Perhaps it was at such a time that Terah, Abraham's father, decided to leave Ur. If Abraham was later the owner of a string of camels,[10] his father in the same business might have been forced to leave Ur when Hammurabi was blocking the trade routes. Abraham's relation to Sarah and her slave, Hagar, are exactly in accordance with Sumerian law. Among contemporary Semitic tribes in Palestine, the sacrifice of the first-born was familiar (Ps. 106^{37}), and we may have a hint of it in Abraham's intended sacrifice of Isaac. The Sumerian idea of sacrifice was higher than that of many of the Semites, and it is recorded in one of its texts quoted by Dorme: "The lamb is the substitute for humanity. He hath given up a lamb for his life."

Jacob's dream of a ladder set up to heaven might be a reminiscence of the ziggurat at Ur and of its three stairways or ladders for the ascending procession of priests. When Rachel "stole the household gods (teraphim) that belonged to her father" (Gen. 31^{19}), she was seizing therewith her brother's birthright which would make Jacob heir of the wealth of Laban, according to the Code of Hammurabi. Abraham lived with Terah at Haran, Rebecca came from there, and at Haran Jacob stopped for fourteen years. The tent law of Abraham's family was the law of Sumeria. After Terah died in Haran, when the Lord said to Abraham, "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred and from thy father's house," it marked a turning point in the religious advancement of the world. The religion of Ur was a gross polytheism which included some five thousand names of Sumerian gods, and the worship of some of the gods was based upon temple prostitution. Terah had lived in Ur when

---

[10] Gen. 12^{16} and 24^{10} are the first mention of the camel in literature, though they had long been the property of the desert Semites.

"your fathers had served other gods" (Josh. 24^2) as a follower of the moon-god.

In North Syrian texts, the local equivalent of Nannar is Terah. If Abraham's father was called Terah-Nannar, he was under the special protection of the moon-god, Nannar, and bore his name. When he moved, "Haran was the only other important town of Mesopotamia to have the moon-god for its special patron; from the one city of Nannar Terah goes to the other."[11] Men who had lost faith in Ur, however, had lost faith in its discredited and conquered moon-god, Nannar. But in Abraham's time in Ur, each prosperous family had its own family chapel and each citizen placed himself under the protection of a special deity. Worship was conducted by the head of the family and the Sumerian father was the priest as well as master of his household.

Terah and his family would take with them the *teraphim,* or household images (Gen. $31^{19\text{-}55}$) which were not local deities like the moon-god but could move with them to distant cities and tents. Abraham went out forever from the polytheism and carnal worship of Ur with his humble household god which was nameless, as were the teraphim in all the household chapels of Ur. It was a great moment when Mohammed, who had learned his monotheism from Christians and Jews, championed Allah against the three hundred and sixty polytheistic gods of Mecca; but it was a greater moment when Abraham left the polytheism of Ur with only his humble, nameless, household god.

Later we read: "Abram believed the Eternal, who counted his trust as real religion, and said to him, 'I am the Eternal who brought you from Chaldean Ur to give you possession of this land.' " "God said to Moses, 'I-will-be-what-I-will-be: tell the Israelites that I-will-be has sent you to them . . . the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob has sent you to them; tell them This is my name for all time, this is my title for all ages' " (Gen. 15^7; Ex. $3^{14\text{-}15}$, Moffatt's translation.) The record shows that Abraham was not yet a monotheist but his now separated and purified faith held the germ of the future development of the high ethical monotheism that alone could prove to be the cornerstone of a progressive Western civilization. The God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob was to become Jehovah the God of Sinai, the Eternal, God of the Hebrew people, and finally the God and Father of Jesus Christ. In Abraham and Sumerian Ur, we are at the headwaters not only of the midstream of Western civilization—we are at the source of the agelong process of the education of the Hebrew people. Here is the beginning also of the self-disclosure or self-revelation of God, the educator of his people, and the Lord of history.

---

[11] *Ibid.* p. 196.

Recognizing the principle of evolution throughout nature and history, we cannot expect to find the highest development at the beginning of civilization in Ur. Our only wonder is at the very great attainments of the ancient culture when compared with savages and barbarians in other parts of the world. We can see in Sumerian Ur, even before the later development of conscience in Egypt, the beginning of a demand for justice and a growing recognition of its importance. A trading nation early learned the prudential value of honesty as the best policy. Some of the early laws of Ur incorporated later in those of Hammurabi were based upon the principle of justice. A measure of brotherhood also was realized among the Sumerians and the Semites separately, and then extended under Sargon, the Semitic ruler of Sumer and Accad (2700-2600 B.C.), to a wider tolerance and cooperation.

Liberty was not yet an ideal or an achievement, but there were trends toward it greater than under the autocratic monarchs of Egypt. We can trace also the first beginnings, at least, of the love of God and man, though these never approached the mighty passion of the monotheistic prophets of Israel. There were elements of mercy as well as of fear in the religion of Ur. Hammurabi had not invented but received from Ur the germ of his insistence on justice and mercy for the widow, the orphan, and the poor, and the high place given to woman and marriage. And all the best that Ur had learned was transmitted to surrounding and succeeding nations by their great invention of writing. Thus Ur takes a noble place in the education of the race. And surely God was in the history of Ur.

2. The Dawn of Conscience in Egypt

We found that the earliest known civilization upon our planet, far older than that in Egypt, or China, or India, had its rise among the Sumerians at Ur. Dr. James Henry Breasted in *The Dawn of Conscience,* shows that for three thousand years Egypt witnessed a further development of civilization, especially in her ethical and esthetic life. We can trace the continued development of conscience in Egypt with higher ideals of conduct and a resulting age of character. The Egyptians had evolved a high standard of morality, in some respects as high as the Decalogue, over a thousand years before the latter was written.[12] The moral ideas of the early Egyptians were worked out in their own social experience, especially in family life. The same was true in the family life of Hosea and other prophets of Israel, for there was "the real light, which enlightens every man, coming then into the world."

Civilization was born in the river valleys of the Euphrates and the Nile—in Ur and in Egypt—in the eastern and southeastern corner of the Mediterranean. The interfusion of these two early cultures of Lower Babylonia and Egypt gave an impetus to civilization among the Hebrews, the Phoenicians, and the surrounding nations for centuries to come.

---

[12] We have now in the British Museum an Egyptian papyrus of the tenth century B.C. called the "Wisdom of Amenemope," which was translated into Hebrew and widely circulated in Palestine. It was obviously a source of a whole section of the Book of Proverbs. "For Amenemope the consciousness of God is the determining factor in his conception of life and his entire behavior." J. H. Breasted, *The Dawn of Conscience,* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933, p. 321.

The records show, however, that no force in the life of ancient man so pervades all his activities as does his religion. It gives birth to organized society, to architecture, art, music, literature—beginning with man's sacred books which record his long oral traditions—and to every aspect of his early culture. Early man is motivated by the hopes and fears of religion, its feasts are his calendar, its outward observances are his education in the evolution of art, literature, and science.

Much later science develops from man's early magic; astrology gives birth to astronomy; alchemy to chemistry. For early man, religion is the beating heart of all his life; thought and religion are interfused, church and state are one, the king is divine and all life develops from a single center. The Egyptians were living in simple houses of sunburned brick when they built their mighty temples in enduring stone. The citizens of Athens were housed in what would seem to us unsanitary hovels when they reared in priceless marble the Parthenon as the House of God, the most perfect building ever erected by man on earth.

Possibly as early as 3500 B.C., one of the earliest discussions of right and wrong is found in a drama celebrating the supremacy of Memphis as the capital of united Egypt under King Menes of the first dynasty. Under this stable and united government there arose one of the earliest known conceptions of a moral order, and of righteousness, justice, and truth, advancing far beyond Sumerian Ur in this regard. This same drama also taught that the god would decree life for the good, and death for the wicked. The evolution of the idea of a judgment beyond the grave and finally of a universal judgment became more definite before 2000 B.C., in Egypt's early Feudal Age. In the sixteenth century B.C., the judgment included a detailed scrutiny of all transgressions and an ethical ordeal which tested the entire moral quality of the life of each individual. This high moral ideal was early weakened, however, by the magical rites of the

Book of the Dead, to enable the deceased to profess sinless perfection as he sought to deceive the dreaded but blind divine judge. The religion of Egypt lacked the vitality and power of that of the later Hebrews. The cult of immortality became an escape from the realities of the present life instead of an inspiration for the life that now is.

No people, ancient or modern, gave the idea of life beyond the grave such prominence as the Egyptians. Relative to this belief, the Sumerians and all Babylonians were practical, commercial, materialistic, and this-worldly, while the Egyptians were other-worldly. In no other country was the human body so preserved by soil and climate, and no other people equaled the Egyptians in the art of embalming, the object of which was to preserve the body for the soul in the future life. There are graves in Egypt from before 4000 B.C. when men buried their dead in the expectation of a life beyond. With the dead were buried, as in Sumeria, their equipment of pottery, flint implements, stone weapons, utensils, and personal ornaments to furnish the departed for the future life. Many centuries later, we find the written documents and the often beautiful papyrus prayers with which the dead were buried with the often repeated cry: "Let me live, oh, let me live!"

A great pyramid, which was a symbol of the sun, was built by each king so that he and his nobles might dwell with the Sun-god in his glorious celestial kingdom. Each Pharaoh of the Third and Fourth dynasties (c. 3000 to 2750 B.C.) spent a large share of his available resources in erecting a vast tomb to receive his body and insure its preservation from death. The cemetery at Gizeh, near Cairo, with its populous city of the dead, stretches for sixty miles in the desert along the banks of the Nile. The great pyramid of Cheops was erected with marvelous geometric accuracy as a mighty feat of ancient engineering, with its two million blocks of limestone, weighing over two tons each, rising to a height of over 480 feet. The tomb of Napoleon and that of Lenin are arresting, but this pyramid is, perhaps, the most impressive monument on earth to man's faith in immortality. The king as an absolute monarch was deified and the whole state was organized to erect by forced labor this tomb of the god-king which had to be finished in less than twenty years. It seemed fitting to impoverish, if necessary, a whole empire to build the tomb for one such divine king. One man alone was free and of priceless worth. Only much later, when these rich tombs had been rifled and these proud monuments had fallen into decay, came the hope of an after-life for the common man in Egypt.[13]

Osiris, the most beloved god of Egypt, and many of the local gods of Western Asia, were held to have lived, died, and risen again. The career of Osiris pictured a cycle of nature, the spring being a type of the resurrection. This faith in immortality in Egypt for more than three thousand years is in striking contrast with the undeveloped doctrines of the after-life among the Hebrews. Not until after 200 B.C., about the time of Daniel, do we find two passages in the Old Testament, both apocalypses, that hold the first clear hope of the resurrection (Daniel 12^{1-3}; Isaiah 26^{19}).

The earliest social prophets appear in Egypt at a time of administrative collapse, with the demand for a return to good government and for a righteous king. In "The Eloquent Peasant," the poor man thus speaks: "Justice is for eternity. It descendeth with him that doeth it to the grave. His name is not effaced on earth. Such is the uprightness of the word of God." Another Egyptian social prophet writes the "Admonitions of Ipuwer," making an arraignment of the evils of the time, with suggestions for the regeneration of society, and giving a dim picture of a golden or Messianic age which he hoped might follow. This age of justice for all mankind takes the form of Messianism through the hope of a righteous ruler. This was some fifteen hundred years before the Messianic prophets of the Old Testament, though the Egyptians never distantly approach either the social passion or the glowing personal promises of Amos, Isaiah, and Jeremiah.

---

[13] After 1600 B.C., the developed morality of the Book of the Dead gives a remarkable picture of the soul entering the Hall of Righteousness when, purged of all the evil it has done, it beholds the face of the god. The judge, Osiris, is assisted by forty-two gods (for the forty or more administrative divisions of Egypt). The soul protests its righteousness: It has never been guilty of murder, theft, falsehood, covetousness, anger, pride, sexual sin, of any wrong against the gods, or of any of the forty-two sins enumerated. It is not, however, a confession of sin but a protestation of self-righteousness. Only later in Egyptian religion comes a deeper sense of sin and of the grace of God. Beautifully illuminated papyrus documents now in the British Museum picture the judgment of the soul and its entrance into the celestial hereafter. *Ibid.* pp. 255-257.

Under the young king, Iknaton, Egypt makes its one brief approach to monotheism. The brilliant and brave youth changed his name from Amenhotep to Iknaton, ("the god Aton is satisfied.") The familiar name of the god, Amon, was expunged as far as possible from all monuments and records and the God, Aton, substituted. The young king built a new capital at Tell el-Amarna, backed by the court party and fiercely opposed by the jealous priests of the god, Amon. We have a whole series of beautiful hymns to the Sun-god in his new solar universalism, in the sweep of his power over all men in the whole world. The symbol of the old Sun-god had been the pyramid, while that of the new Sun-god was the solar disk with its diverging beams radiating downward, each terminating in a human hand, as a suggestion of the god's helpfulness in the affairs of men: "Thou art the mother and father of all that thou hast made. . . . And every heart rejoices because of seeing thee, when thou dawnest as their lord." This is perhaps the first expression of universalism in religion.

The young king, Iknaton, may possibly have dreamed of a world religion to displace the nationalism and polytheism of the preceding twenty centuries of Egyptian practice. But neither the character of the young king nor his conceptions possessed the germ of an ethical monotheism that could save Egypt or the world, or provide a rational basis for a universal religion, philosophy, or human experience. The new faith gave birth to a brief revolution in Egyptian religion and art for a favored few courtiers, but it never reached either the old priests or the masses of Egypt, much less those of any other lands. Iknaton was, perhaps, a "God-intoxicated man" who completely ignored Osiris and other popular gods. For a few brief years his was a new faith and a new teaching, coupled with emotional fervor; but with the passing of the young king, his enemies of the older priesthoods and faiths obliterated every possible surviving evidence of the writings of the king and of this hated rule, and he was referred to as "the criminal." It is too much to say with Breasted that Iknaton is "the first individual" in history and the first revolutionist. His hymns are beautiful and emotional, but they have no adequate theological basis and little social morality or ethical content. He could not with a gesture, by seeking to universalize an old nature-god, alter history and change the deep-rooted custom, habit, and faith of an ancient polytheism.

Iknaton's feeble son-in-law, Tutenkhamon, restored the old ways for the father of all the gods, Amon, and the old moral order of "righteousness," wiping out the very memory of the young idealist, though the effects of the revolution did not wholly disappear. The human and beneficent aspects of god and his care for all men had taken hold on the thinking classes, and these attributes were now attributed to Amon. The next two centuries witnessed the development of a deeper devotional spirit and a confidence of the common people in the solicitude of their god for all, even the least of his creatures:

> Who cometh to the silent,
> Who saveth the poor
> Who giveth breath to everyone he loveth. . . .
> Give me (thy) hand
> Save me, shine upon me,
> For thou makest my sustenance.
> Thou art the sole god, there is no other . . .
> Who leadeth—for all men.

Egypt was under the spell, however, of a paralyzing conservatism with its fixed conventions that had set like cement, and there were no prophets to smash that conservatism.

Nearly all the local gods were represented in animal form, while some were conceived as trees or as inanimate objects. Many were believed to be incarnated in some special beast, such as the Apis bull. Anthropomorphism may have its dangers but it is far above the concepts and practices of animal idolatry. From this the Hebrews were saved after long struggle by their absolute commandment:

> You shall have no Gods but me. You shall not carve any idols for yourselves, the shape of anything in heaven above or on the earth below or in the sea; you shall not bow down to them nor worship them for I the Eternal your God am a jealous God (Ex. 20[1-5], Moffatt's translation).

Even the new reformed religion of Iknaton lasted little more than a dozen years. His reformation failed because it was iconoclastic and uncompromising, entirely suppressing the popular worship and also because it was purely contemplative, impractical, and lacking in ethical content. While Iknaton and his court were singing hymns to the sun, his empire in Asia was falling to pieces from neglect. Self-satisfaction too often marked the Egyptian worshiper who was lacking in a sense of sin and of true humility. His characteristic confession was, "I am not guilty." Toward the end, there was steady degeneration and there was not enough vitality in Egyptian religion to put forth a single new shoot. Neither the Sumerians nor the Egyptians could produce a consistent and dynamic ethical monotheism to meet the world's greatest need. That had to be left to the Hebrews.

Dr. Breasted says:

> After the fall of the Egyptian Empire in the twelfth century B.C., the forces of life both within and without were exhausted and had lost their power to stimulate the moral thinking of Egypt to any further vital development . . . Egypt rapidly degenerated into a sacerdotal state.[14]

Egypt now fell back upon her great past. The life of this noble people which had risen and ripened for three thousand years had nearly ended when that of the more virile Hebrews had hardly begun. Finally, however, the churches of a new Christian faith were established in old Memphis even before its living tradition had been reduced to writing in any of the Four Gospels of the Christian New Testament. Egypt had not lived in vain but had given rich gifts to succeeding cultures and civilizations, especially to the people who were to become the bearers of ethical monotheism for the world that was now being prepared for a universal faith. Egypt passed on her cultural treasures to the high Minoan civilization of Crete which reached the zenith of its power and wealth from 1600 to 1400 B.C. and then to Mycenae, to the whole Greek world and far eastern Mediterranean.

---

[14] *Ibid.* p. 330.

Our debt to Egypt will never be fully known. Egypt made creative inventions or improvements in agriculture, metallurgy, industry, and engineering. There was the probable invention of glass and linen, of paper and ink, of the calendar and the clock, of geometry and possibly the alphabet. Egypt contributed to the refinement of dress and ornament, of furniture and comfortable homes, of cultured society and life. There was a remarkable development of orderly and peaceful government, of the census and the post, of primary and secondary education, and of technical training for government service. To all this we must add the advancement of writing and literature, of science and medicine; the first clear written evidence of individual and public conscience, the first demand for social justice, the first widespread monogamy, the first essays in moral philosophy. We must acknowledge also our debt for the advancement of architecture, sculpture, and mechanical arts never before attained. All these discoveries and inventions were not lost but contributed to and carried by the Phoenicians, Syrians, Jews, Cretans, Greeks and Romans, until they became a rich part of the cultural heritage of mankind.[15] Egypt was in the mid-current of the development of the early cultures that finally produced our Western civilization. Egyptians achieved a high religion and no people lived more for eternity. They recognized also a fine balance between the individual and social aspects of their faith. For centuries there was a real development in the idea of justice, a mild form of brotherhood, of relative liberty, and of personal religion. Beginning with one absolute autocratic divine monarch, there was a growing appreciation of the value of the individual man, even of the poorest. All through the centuries, Egyptians held communion with their gods. Although they never achieved a true ethical monotheism, there were rising moral standards, a deepening sense of sin, and at least a dim apprehension of divine saving grace and forgiving mercy. If one can see God in history at all, it is not difficult to see him in the history of Egypt.[16]

---

[15] See Will Durant's *The Story of Civilization,* 1935, Vol. II, p. 217.

3. The Ethical Monotheism of the Hebrews

There is a once fertile crescent of land that made history in the Near East. It stretched from the delta of the Nile to that of the Euphrates. The western end included Palestine and the eastern Mediterranean; the eastern reached the Persian Gulf and included the northern extension of the Arabian Desert, Sumerian Ur, Babylonia, and northern Assyria. All these early civilizations were closely interrelated.

---

[16] The brilliant work of Dr. Breasted—with that of Maspero, Sir W. M. Flinders Petrie, and all the archaeologists who preceded and followed him—has placed us under such a debt of gratitude that it may seem ungracious to point out shortcomings in his point of view, relative to our own. Dr. Breasted is so intent upon showing that almost all the truth disclosed by the prophets of Israel was found much earlier in Egypt that he unconsciously depreciates the far higher insights of the Hebrew prophets in what seemed to him their so-called period of "revelation." Writing in 1933, in the midst of this great crisis in history, he says: "What we of this generation need more than anything else" [is not a return to faith in God and obedience to his laws, but] *"is confidence in man."* (*The Dawn of Conscience,* p. xv.) That is, a return to the rationalism of the Renaissance, of the Enlightenment—and of Chicago humanism.

Influences that permeate our civilization today have come down to us from every part of that fertile crescent.[17]

For many millenniums, Palestine, which lay off the main road between Egypt and Mesopotamia, was more barbarous and backward than the highest of these early civilizations. It was "the least of all lands," only 143 miles in length from "Dan to Beersheba," with an average width of some forty miles and an area comparable to Wales or the State of New Jersey. Recent archaeological excavations in Palestine have been richly rewarding. In 1925, the Oxford archaeologist, Mr. F. Turville-Petre, discovered in a "robbers' cave" near the Sea of Galilee between Capernaum and Nazareth a skull of a young man or woman of about thirty years of age of the extinct Neanderthal race, dating from twenty thousand to forty thousand years ago.[18]

THE HEBREWS IN PALESTINE

The unique importance of the people of Israel was not due to their high intellectual and esthetic achievements like the Sumerians, Egyptians, and Greeks, but to their religion which became the mother of the three great monotheisms of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. It was providential that Palestine lay at the crossroads of the ancient world at the meeting point and battleground between Asia, Africa, and Europe. This meant that Syria was an inevitable center of syncretism. The proud conservatism of Egypt could not readily accept new or foreign truth. The Hebrews, on the other hand, received relatively freely over long periods from Ur, Babylonia, Egypt, the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and later the Aegeans, the Greeks, the Persians, and finally the Romans.

---

[17] Even Chaldean astrology and astronomy left an indelible mark upon our calendar in the names that we apply to the days of the week, which were set apart for the worship of various divinities. The day devoted to the sun-god of Egypt and other lands became Sunday, to the moon-god of Ur, Monday, and so on to Saturn's-day, Saturday. As our language came to us along a northern route, it contains Norse elements such as Woden's-day, Wednesday, Thor's-day, Thursday, and Frigg's-day, Friday. The names of the days of our week and of our months are suggestive of countless other influences that have come down to us from all the greatest of these ancient nations through the mid-current of history.

[18] Sir Arthur Keith, *New Discoveries Relating to the Antiquity of Man,* New York, W. W. Norton, 1931, pp. 173-183. This Galilean skull was found among implements of the paleolithic age and with it were the bones of the two-horned rhinoceros (the Biblical unicorn?), the hippopotamus (behemoth), and twenty-two species of mammals including the horse, ox, and camel, that thrived in a warmer and more favorable climate than is found in contemporary Palestine. On October 10, 1945, there were unearthed in northern Palestine the bones of a mammoth that had served as a feast for a primitive tribe some 60,000 years ago.

The excavations of Dr. J. H. Breasted and others on Mount Megiddo and the plain of Megiddo (the Hellenized form of Armageddon) have revealed the history of this gateway between two continents for the possession of which the kings of Asia and Africa struggled for centuries. Here marched and fought the armies of Egypt, Assyria, and Babylon for a thousand years. Through the same pass, Lord Allenby pierced the Turkish lines and won the last battle of Armageddon in 1918.

The Hebrews were not an unmixed race, and their theology did not derive from a single source. Their religion was a very slow growth. For the first millennium they humbly borrowed but made little contribution to others in return, yet at last they felt they had a universal message for the whole world. The geography of the country, as in Greece, fostered a certain exclusiveness, a love of independence and individuality, which made them, because of their religion, a "peculiar" and a "chosen" people. Never marked for glory, but rather for suffering, the Hebrews were released from the superior might of conquest of the great empires which had in turn their brief day. They escaped from the political and commercial entanglement of their more powerful neighbors and for centuries were able to develop their own peculiar potentialities.

Apart from Scripture we have historic evidence that the the superior and elaborate civilization of the Canaanites was supremely practical. It had borrowed, improved, and diffused the art of writing and had a genius for commerce. It had passed from the age of stone and of copper to iron, and many of the arts were highly developed. The agricultural cults of their baals and astartes, however, produced local divinities who became political gods and tyrants rather than righteous rulers. Their religion was always connected with physical phenomena, maintaining bloody and orgiastic rites, human sacrifice, and temple prostitution. The Canaanites had a relatively high level of culture coupled with a lower stage of morality and religion. Their depravity was at times notorious, as in the vices attributed to Sodom and Gomorrah. In early times the act of settling in the territory of a foreign god carried with it the obligation of rendering him the worship to which he was entitled. David felt that to banish a man was equivalent to saying to him: "Go, serve other gods!" (I Sam. 26[19]). In the early days, the Hebrews worship of Jahweh and of the baals was carried on simultaneously. Only gradually Jahweh became the sole object of worship and some of the attributes of the baals were transferred to him.

The Hebrews themselves were originally nomads, moving as Bedouins, breeding cattle, and living in tents.[19] They were a people of tough fibre who retained the character and traditions of the free fierce nomad, whose hand was against every man and every man's hand against him. No other people could have so maintained their independence and separate quality over more than five thousand years through such unparalleled conquest, dispersion, and persecution. Not only did this insignificant tribe of Aramaean[20] nomads maintain their place in the very mid-current of history; they became its gulf stream, undiminished and unabsorbed through the vast oceans of the world.

The Israelites brought into Canaan strong passions, a lively and vivid imagination, a fierce pride, an unabated virility, and a deathless love for the free life of the nomad that survived all captivities and dispersions. When they entered Canaan, the Hebrews were warlike, fierce, vindictive, ready in a blood feud to avenge a kinsman's honor of life, and contemptuous of those who acquiesced in servitude. Conditions of their early desert life and of Palestine developed an invincible tendency to rugged individualism, and to segregation in groups and cliques. They suffered neither their elders, warchiefs, nor kings to be autocrats. Their ancient Bedouin individualism was long opposed to kingly power; it rebelled against the growth of social distinctions and the development of large estates or concentrated wealth. The poorest was equal to the richest. All partook of the same simple food and coarse clothing, and inhabited together the primitive goat's-hair tent. Liberty, equality, and fraternity were developed in them centuries before they made their appearance among the free Greeks.

---

[19] We are indebted in this section to Adolphe Lods, professor of the Sorbonne, in his *Israel from its Beginnings to the Middle of the Eighth Century,* New York, Alfred Knopf, 1932, pp. 190-206.

[20] Jacob was a "roving Aramaen" (Deut. 26[5]). Aramaen merchants carried their language over the East till it largely displaced the Hebrew. It was the language of the common people in Jesus' day in Galilee, of his apostles and of the early Christian church. It was the language of the expansion of Christianity in the Orient as Greek was in the Occident.

The Hebrews were always a divided yet a strangely unified people. Their force of character and the powerful personalities of their leaders fostered both unification and diversities. More than the idlers of Athens whom Paul addressed, the Hebrews were always deeply religious. As they entered Palestine they believed that the world was peopled with powers and spirits: hence their cults of trees, springs, and mountains, a fear-inspired veneration of the dead and of certain animals. Wherever the Hebrew met some unusual manifestation of energy, in an oasis of the desert or in the magic power of a chief, in the ecstasies of a seer, or in priests, prophets, or even in words or names, he ascribed these to supernatural spirits. For him the plural *elohim,* which finally came to denote a god, originally designated divine forces or powers. Abraham's or Israel's God was at first only one among many. The Israelites were monolatrous long before they became monotheists, monolatry being a form of polytheism. In the judgment of many scholars, pure monotheism hardly began until the eighth century B.C.—the century of Amos—and did not become fully conscious until the sixth. It was during these centuries that the oral traditions of Abraham, the patriarchs, and Moses were reduced to writing in an advanced age of monotheism which sometimes gave the false impression that they had always been monotheists. Jahweh was regarded as more powerful than any other gods but only finally as the true and only God. Increasingly he was regarded as righteous, holy, and a "jealous" God who could not tolerate idolatry, sensuous worship, and human injustice.

George A. Barton, in his *Archaeology and the Bible,* traces many parallels between Biblical literature and that of Babylonia whose oldest traditions were derived from Ur. The Epic of Creation in Babylon and Assyria of the seventh century, B.C., has an obvious connection with the first chapter of Genesis. In both, "in the beginning" of time there is primeval chaos over the waters of the "deep"; in both heaven and earth are created; in both there is a solid firmament, or "covering," which divides the waters above and those below on the earth; in both the arrangement is in a series of seven as the sacred number; in both there are special sacrifices every seventh day.

The Babylonian account is mythological and polytheistic, where the gods quarrel or crouch in fear, while the Biblical account is lifted by inspiration to the high plane of ethical monotheism, where Jehovah takes the place of the ignoble Marduk. There is also a Babylonian legend of the fall of man. Adapa, like Adam, gained knowledge which had been previously a divine monopoly. In both accounts there is a tree of life; in both certain food may make man immortal; in both there is punishment for eating the forbidden fruit or food. The Babylonians also had longlived kings, each ruling from nine to twelve hundred years, resembling the ages of Methusaleh and the patriarchs. The Sumerian Adime resembles Adam while Ziugiddu is the Sumerian and Babylonian Noah. The Babylonian account of the flood also closely resembles the Biblical narrative. Both record a divine revelation to the hero of the deluge, while other men are ignorant of the coming catastrophe; in both a vessel is built covered with pitch without and within; in both the vessel embarks on the flood while the masses are destroyed; in both the ark is stranded on a mountain; in both, birds are sent out, the occupants of the arc disembark, offer sacrifice, and are promised that there shall not be a future deluge. We have the creation and flood tablets of Nippur which antedate 2000 B.C. In Babylonian records we have also an account of the origin of agriculture and of the city. There is the name of a farmer, Abraham, who lived near Babylon, and the names Jacob and Joseph appear in both Babylonian and Egyptian records, although they bear no resemblance to the Biblical characters.

The code of Hammurabi (2130-2088 B.C.), which includes the older laws and traditions of Ur, contains striking parallels to the laws in Exodus 21-23 and in Deuteronomy. The principle of an eye for an eye is the basis of many of the penalties in both. While the code of Hammurabi is only a civil code, that of the Bible is both civil and religious. The Biblical code is for a simple agricultural people, while that of Hammurabi is for a more advanced and prosperous commercial civilization, which is, however, on a lower polytheistic religious plane. There is an obvious and inescapable connection between the Mesopotamian and the Biblical records. Both are traditional and neither approaches the plane of history as judged by modern standards of historical criticism. What differentiates them, however, is the evidence of high spiritual inspiration and revelation in the Biblical account.[21]

It was the personality and activity of Moses that brought Israel into existence as a nation. Beneath all the legends of oral tradition there is evidence of a dominant personality in Israel's early history, the indelible impress of an Egyptian bondage for at least a portion of the Israelites, and the lasting tradition of a period of wilderness wandering. It was Moses who introduced his people to Jahweh who became henceforth Israel's God, and Israel Jahweh's people. It was he who developed out of a jealous Bedouin hoard a growing national consciousness. Yahweh was not recognized as the God of Israel until the time of Moses. In all the three parallel Pentateuchal documents the figure of Moses dominates the early national life of Israel. If after allowing for all the limitations of historical relativism, we are forced to regard Zoroaster, Buddha, and Confucius as founders of religions, we cannot deny the historical character of Moses.

---

[21] George A. Barton's *Archaeology and the Bible,* New York, American Sunday School Union, 1916, pp. 235-313.

Jahwism, however, was always characterized by exclusiveness, as Jahweh insisted on being the sole God of his people, without denying the rights of other gods for other peoples. In early years individuals might have their private cults as Leah, Rachel, and David had their household images, or *teraphim*. Egyptian influence played a surprisingly limited part in the formation of Israel's national religion which seemed to be little affected by Egypt's advanced beliefs regarding the future life. More and more Israel's national life was deeply permeated with religion. There was a growing protest, however, against the narrowness and poverty of a purely national cult. When at last the prophets all agreed in proclaiming the one God of absolute righteousness, they were laying the foundation in history for the first time of a universal religion.

With the rise of Assyria, Israel lost her political independence on the day that tribute was paid to Tiglath-pileser. The problem now was to explain defeat if the people were the chosen of God. The answer of the prophets implied that it was because Israel had broken the covenant relation. The prophets' next problem was to preserve the identity of the Hebrews after they had lost their political freedom. The conditions of deliverance laid down by the prophets were at first two: social righteousness and religious purity. The first is stressed by Amos and the second by Hosea. Twenty-seven hundred years ago, an obscure herder of sheep on the Judean hillsides brooded over the wickedness of his day until God and the invisible spiritual world became for him the great burning realities. In an age already corrupt, new city life had brought new temptations of rapid wealth over against increasing poverty. Amos challenges the well-fed and sanguine patriotism of northern Israel as he strides into the market place of Bethel and thunders his message that seems to us today strangely modern:

> The Eternal thunders out of Sion . . . "They sell honest folk for money, the needy for a pair of shoes, they trample down the poor like dust . . . Let justice well up like fresh water, let honesty roll in full tide . . . I am rousing against you a nation (Assyria) O house of Israel . . . What are you more than Ethiopians, to me, ye Israelites? I brought up Israel from Egypt? Yes, and Philistines from Crete, from Kir the Aramaeans. Mine eyes are on the sinful realm, to wipe it off the earth."[22]

DIVINE REVELATION AND PROPHETIC DISCOVERY

In the primitive stories of Abraham and of Moses, we have only a record of early oral tradition. When we reach the writing of the prophets, however, our feet are upon the solid earth of history and we enter upon a new epoch in human religious experience. The time of the prophets from Amos to Malachai was a creative period for the human race. It produced the philosophies of Laotze and Confucius in China, of Gautama Buddha in India, the monotheism of Zoroaster in Persia, and the great Pythagoras as the spiritual predecessor of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle in Greece. But none of these approached the prophets of Israel in the moral certitude of their experience of ethical monotheism. It was so unique in the experience of the whole human race that we must ask how far it was due to human discovery and how far to divine revelation. Our conviction is that it was both and that these are two sides of one experience. Divine revelation and human discovery are complementary and correlative but the initiative is always divine; the slow and halting response is human.

---

[22] Amos 2^6; 5^{24}; 6^{14}; 9^7, Moffatt's translation.

Deeper than the briliant Greeks, the prophets came to grips with the moral and spiritual problems of human life and destiny, especially the central problem of the character of God, the problem of evil, the cause of suffering, and the meaning of history. We can trace Israel's long pilgrimage for two millenniums in its discovery of God. Amos emphasized the righteousness of Jahweh, Hosea discovered his loving-kindness. Isaiah saw the source of these qualities of righteousness and love in the divine holiness. Isaiah's younger contemporary Micah makes the first great summary of the essentials: "Only to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God." Standing at the summit of Old Testament prophecy, Jeremiah carries individual, personal religion to its highest possible development under the Old Covenant. Finally the great Prophet of the Exile (546-539 B.C.), out of a pure ethical monotheism, proclaims the unity of the God of all mankind. He sees dimly the spectral appearance of a Suffering Servant of humanity.

The prophets left us their burning words, but, save in a few brief references in Jeremiah, we know little of their lives. Standing on the solid ground of history, however, one at last arrives who not only sums up the whole message of the prophets and of all true religion in the love of God and man, but embodies these in his own life. In the record of the first three Gospels, he is, like the prophets, always man, tempted in all points like as we are, and submitting to the utmost to all that history can do to a son of man. From first to last he lived a life wholly within the will of God. Rejected by his own people—as a lamb led to the slaughter—he submitted to the death of a malefactor.

In some strange but simple way Jesus reveals God as Father to men. Standing at the very summit of ethical monotheism in his experience, in his character, and in his teaching, Jesus gives not only to his own people who rejected him, but to the whole human race the highest revelation of God known to humanity. We may not be able at once to rise to the "impossible possibility" of Jesus' high teaching that we are to love just as God loves and to live as our heavenly Father would have us. Yet it is significant that man's highest conception of deity cannot be stated except in terms of Jesus. Jesus not only gave the world the highest, deepest, and most intimate conception of God in all history, but somehow, uniquely, as humanity's vicarious sufferer, he enables us to believe in God. Somehow he was able to share his own experience of God with his immediate followers and with an ever-widening circle of believers across the centuries so that they came to *know* God for themselves, age after age, each in his own experience. And he makes us more sure of the meaning of history.

It is impossible to estimate our debt to the Hebrews or to Judeo-Christian religion in the way we have done to Sumeria or Egypt, or as we shall estimate our debt to the Greeks and the Romans. Our cultural vocabulary is chiefly Greek and Latin. Our words, "morals," and "ethics," for instance, are Greek and our word, "religion," is Latin, but well-nigh the whole content of our moral and religious life is of Hebrew origin. Two thousand years of religion came to its climax in Jesus. In a way the meaning of history and of life itself depends upon our view of him and our relation to him. There is a sense in which he is all or nothing. Can we believe that in some way in Jesus, God himself entered history? Is it too good to be true that in some unique way "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself," thus realizing the meaning of history? We press for no particular theological viewpoint here, but unless or until we find God in Jesus, we shall probably find him nowhere in life or in history.

Brief and inadequate as this account is of the ethical monotheism of the Hebrews, in contrast to the history of Ur or Egypt, of Greece or Rome, it is evident that Hebrew religion was utterly unique and different from anything else in the ancient world. And their conception of God was different—different from the pale humanism of Confucius or the later Greeks, from the vague pantheism of India, or the agnosticism of Gautama, or the materialism of ancient or modern science. God was creator and redeemer, a God of power and righteousness, and human obligation, or value, consisted in the doing of God's will. We shall find that only in the light of this Hebraic-Christian ethical monotheism do we discover the full meaning of history and that, whether man is conscious of it or not, God has a dominant part in the whole of man's life.

It was this ethical monotheism that realized, as no other culture or civilization, the four principles of justice, brotherhood, liberty, and the love of God and man in vital, dynamic religion. No other people or religion ever had such a high standard of justice in the light of the righteousness of God. No other ever conceived of such a universal spiritual brotherhood in the light of the divine fatherhood. No other, until the Greeks, ever had such a passion for liberty. And none approached them in the two great commandments to love God with all the heart and their neighbor as themselves, as these became the foundation for the highest ethical monotheism of a world religion. Judged by these standards alone, the prophets were surely right in holding that God was indeed working in history.

4. The Hellenic Heritage

In this section we must again remind the reader that in no artificial, puritan separation of the so-called sacred and secular are we concerned in this book to show that God is in history only in so far as it is religious. We must repeat that we believe that nothing human is foreign to us—or to God. We are concerned throughout this volume—because we believe that God is concerned—not only with the moral and spiritual, but with the intellectual and esthetic, the economic and political, the individual and social aspects of life. We glory in the culture of Greece as much as does the nontheistic humanist, because we believe that God was in our Hellenic as well as in our Hebraic heritage. The Hellenic alone is shallow and the exclusively Hebraic is often narrow and bigoted. We need both for the overflowing fullness of the abundant life, and we are not departing from our subject *God in History* when we seek to discover and recover our Hellenic heritage. Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle are ours as well as Moses, Isaiah, and Paul. And the culture of Greece, a human achievement by the grace of God, was meant to be ultimately a universal human heritage.

We believe that God, who created man in his image, with his God-given intellect and a mind capable of thinking God's thoughts after him, would not be satisfied in an end-product of a devout savage who worshiped the Great Spirit in ignorance, nor in an illiterate orthodox believer with all his rich faculties undeveloped. In Scripture we are bidden in mind to be men, not morons. Not only the Hebrew religion but the culture of Greece is our God-given heritage, and the brilliant achievements of their history were for our instruction.

In Sumeria and Egypt, we were dealing with written history that goes back some six thousand years. When we reach the relatively late culture of Greece, we find a people with the spirit of eternal youth who were the heirs of three thousand years of the arts and sciences derived chiefly from Mesopotamia and Egypt. As throughout this book they were, in the words of Newton, "standing on giant shoulders." Will Durant in *The Life of Greece* shows our immeasurable debt to this young civilization of Greece which flourished from about 1000 to 480 B.C. It is perhaps not too much to say that, excepting machinery, there is scarcely anything secular in our culture or civilization that does not come from Greece: "Schools, gymnasiums, arithmetic, geometry, history, rhetoric, physics, biology, anatomy, hygiene, therapy, poetry, music, tragedy, comedy, philosophy, theology, agnosticism, skepticism, stoicism, epicureanism, ethics, politics, idealism, philanthropy, cynicism, tyranny, plutocracy, democracy: these are all Greek words for cultural forms . . . first matured for good or evil by the abounding energy of the Greeks."[23] In a word, the Greeks laid the foundations for almost all our intellectual growth, and laid them in liberty.

Many of the problems that disturb us today were first faced in Greece: Soil erosion and deforestation; the emancipation of woman and birth control; conservatism versus experimentalism in morals, music, and government; the conflict of science and religion, the war of classes, nations, and continents, the revolution of the poor against the possessing classes, and of the rich against the politically powerful poor; the struggle between democracy and dictatorship, the origins of communism and fascism, the clash between the East and the West—all these were fought out, as though rehearsed for our instruction, in classic Hellenic civilization. We watch civilization arising in Crete, making high attainment in Mycenae, then we see a world of warriors, buccaneers, and troubadours in the rushing spate of Homer's verse,[24] and then follows the rise of Sparta and Athens. From the eighth century, B.C., onward Greek life is grounded in liberty. Their tragedies and comedies are aglow with the fire of freedom.

Ionia and Sparta were the two poles of Greek life at the creative moment of its ripening culture. Here the eye of man first beheld the beauty of the natural world and then later turned within in man's resolve to know himself. Thales and Anaximander mark the birth of natural science and Parmenides of logic. Contemporary with the first great natural philosopher is Solon, the first great law-giver, who tried to prevent men selling themselves into bondage and established the rule of law in place of blind custom, and the foundations of democracy. Law was the foundation of Greek freedom as with "breathless wonder and delight" the people of Athens achieved a written constitution, engraved on the columns of the market place so that all might read and understand its principles. Nature, the individual, and society were understood as a unity, and personality was conceived as unified and harmonized in Greek thought. Among these versatile Greeks, Solon, the statesman, could be a poet and Socrates, the stonecutter, a soldier, teacher, and philosopher. All the free citizens could live a fully human life.

---

[23] Will Durant's *The Life of Greece,* Vol. II of *The Story of Civilization,* New York, Simon & Schuster, 1939, p. vii.

[24] Perhaps as early as 900 B.C. the Greeks had produced the two great epics, the most human and the most poetic ever known, the Iliad, the epic of war and love and the tragedy of a nation's doom; the Odyssey, the epic of home and personal adventure and hard-won happiness.

Socrates had a creative as well as a critical mind and was an original source and stimulant of the greatness of his age, which was bent on the search for wisdom. The most brilliant of his followers, Plato, immortalized his method in a series of philosophical dialogues and founded the philosophical school of the Academy which lasted for nearly a thousand years. Plato turned from the skepticism of his beloved teacher, Socrates, and by the utmost outreach of reason and faith in an age of doubt, was the first to dream of recasting human conditions and of building a better world—a world hitherto dominated by custom and priestcraft. Plato's *Republic,* the first human Utopia, is a young man's dream of a city where the good life was planned for all, and his last unfinished *Laws* is a discussion of regulating such a Utopia. The greatness of Greece was revealed not only in occasional flashes of political and social history, but fully in art, poetry, philosophy, and the beginnings of science. Here human thought first became free—free to dare, to dream, to create the good and to destroy the evil in the world of custom. The Athenian writers were the first modern men and their light was our dawn. Free Athens takes the bold step of recognizing mind as the guiding principle of the universe.

To Plato's Academy in his old age came a handsome young Macedonian provincial, Aristotle, who was skeptical of Plato's abstract ideas but had a passion for fact, and held in his mind the germ of the scientific spirit and of historical criticism. Sane and luminous, but wanting in the self-sacrificial enthusiasm of Socrates and Plato whom he criticized, Aristotle favored slavery and constitutional kings. As the confidante of Philip of Macedonia and the tutor of Alexander, his patron, he had vast sums available for the first organized and financed scientific work in the world, and was able to employ a thousand men in his scientific researches and to make an analysis of one hundred and fifty-eight political constitutions. The death of Alexander ended such scientific endowments for the next two thousand years, and Aristotle's Lyceum became insignificant fifty years after his death. These three great thinkers, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, were among the creative Greeks who awakened in Europe later the hope, common to science, philosophy, and religion, that certain great fundamental principles could be found from which could be deduced as consequences the bewildering multiplicity of the details in our pluralistic history. Among these principles freedom and unity were ever two poles of Greek thought.

In Greece we see democracy fighting for its life against Oriental tyrants at Marathon, organizing itself under Pericles and flowering into the richest culture ever known in history. We watch the human mind scaling unprecedented and dizzy heights in poetry, and drama, philosophy, oratory, history, and art. We see Phidias building the most perfect building the earth ever saw, the Parthenon, and producing statues never equaled again in twenty-three centuries. We move among the greatest galaxy of human genius ever known on earth. We gaze upon the captured beauty of Apelles and Praxiteles. We listen to Philip and Demosthenes, and face the unsolved problems of life in the tragedies of Aeschylus and Sophocles.

Artists and thinkers who were by nature lovers of order and reason sought harmony in the world without and within. Here the human mind became self-conscious and looked into the human heart with the demand, "know thyself." We see the culture of Greece becoming later the soul of the body of

Roman civilization, educating the continent of our savage or barbarous ancestors and in time extending its heritage of culture to the ends of the earth. Thus in the mid-current of history, Greece bequeathed to Europe her sciences, her philosophies, her letters, and her arts as the living cultural basis of our modern world.[25] We believe that we can trace God at work in the history of Greece almost as clearly as in the history of Judea.

These inquisitive Greeks with the child-mind of the race were always asking How and Why, Whence and Whither, and What is the meaning of it all? Greek thinkers set many of the trends of modern thought as truly as Darwin in the nineteenth century altered the way that educated people look at any question. The Greeks shattered an old world and created an ever new one. It was symbolic that even the dissemination of ancient Greek manuscripts from Constantinople was one of the seminal causes of the Renaissance.

At the headwaters of the midstream of our modern civilization, the community of the city state was always small, whether in Ur, in the narrow delta of the Nile, in Palestine, in Athens or Sparta, or the primitive city of Rome.[26] The great movements of history begin with a microcosm, a minority, a remnant, or a small group. The tiny states of early Venice or later Denmark, or Holland, or Switzerland, achieved titanic results. The whole state of Athens in 431 B.C., the year of the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, had a population of adult males of only some forty thousand, and Sparta far less.[27]

---

[25] All the glory that was Greece reminds us of our debt, not only to Greek literature but to modern archaeology. In 1870 Schliemann, in excavating for Priam's Troy, believed he unearthed nine Troys one under another. Similarly, Sir Leonard Wooley found half a dozen buried cities at Carchemish, one below another, when he was excavating there in 1912-1914, and 1919, and at Ur in 1922-1924, until he reached the archaic stone age below them all. Voltaire might well say, "I want to know what were the steps by which men passed from barbarism to civilizations," but it was these modern archaeologists who at last enabled us to trace these steps.

[26] Plato's estimate of the number of citizens in a perfect state rose from 1,000 in the *Republic* to 5,040 in the *Laws*. All citizens must know each other. Aristotle concludes that the natural "limit to the size of the state must be found in the capability of being taken in at a glance," or capable of being comprehended as a unity. Contrast with these the populations of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R., and the British Empire today.

It was by a slow and painful growth that the Greeks realized that man is a political animal, and the Athenians became a body of statesmen, in the "model city" of the world. Having to fight to defend their liberties against the Persian invasion of tyrants, Aeschulapius exults that there is no government in Athens, for *all* the people are the government and every citizen played his part. The greatest Greeks counted as their supreme values truth, beauty, and goodness, freedom, law, and progress, knowledge and virtue, humanity and religion. They would have agreed with all our four principles or cornerstones. Thucydides, one of the earliest and perhaps the greatest of historians, writing as Plato did in dark days, can still exult in the things of the spirit:

> We are the leaders of civilization, the pioneers of the human race. Our society and intercourse is the highest blessing man can confer. . . . Not all the wealth of the East can repay the riches we bestow. . . . Through effort and suffering and on many a stricken field we have found out the secret of human power, which is the secret of happiness. Men have guessed at it under many names; but we alone have learnt to know it and to make it at home in our city. And the name we know it by is Freedom, for it has taught us that to serve is to be free. Do you wonder why it is that "alone among mankind" (will there ever be another nation that can understand what we mean?) we confer our benefits, not on calculations of self-interest, but in the fearless confidence of Freedom?[28]

As Pindar said, the Athenians had "laid the shining steps of freedom's temple." Could any other people have said this with equal truth?

Even at the time of the old historian, Herodotus (c. 480-425 B.C.), Athens had achieved "equal laws, equal speech, democracy." Amid the most brilliant circle of men of genius ever known in the world, every citizen could read and write, and Pindar could cry: "O shining, violet-crowned City of Song, great Athens, bulwark of Hellas, walls divine!" Herodotus believed in the God of history as a moral power overruling the march of events so as to secure justice for men. He sees the overthrow of the Persians as the result of divine judgment. For Herodotus, as for the prophets of Israel, God is used to explain events without allowing fully for secondary causes as moderns do. He is a jealous God, "for the divine being suffers none to have proud thoughts save himself." Human misfortunes are seen, as by the prophets, as God's well-deserved punishments. We are amazed at the vastness of Herodotus' canvas, at its intricacy, and at his wealth of information.[29]

---

[27] Sir Alfred Zimmern's *The Greek Commonwealth*, Oxford Press, 1931, pp. 174-179. Athenaeus reports the census of Athens in 310 B.C. as 21,000 citizens, 10,000 aliens, and 400,000 slaves. Will Durant's *The Life of Greece*, New York, Simon and Schuster, 1939, pp. 561-562.

[28] Sir Alfred Zimmern, *The Greek Commonwealth*, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1931, p. 196.

In striking contrast to Herodotus is Thucydides (c. 460-400 B.C.), the greatest historian of antiquity, as well as the most critical and the most modern. As a rationalist he writes the history of the Greek city-state in the light of political, economic, and psychological factors. He was an Athenian patriot who had served his turn as a magistrate and a general and is our ultimate authority on his contemporary Greece from 433 to 411 B.C., including the brilliant age of Pericles. Though lacking our discovery of chronology and our time perspectives, after witnessing the fall of Athens, he records for us the priceless record of the Golden Age of Greece.

In the great funeral oration of Pericles over the noble dead of Athens, we hear not only the voice of Pericles—and the words of Thucydides as he himself frankly confesses—but the living and eternal voice of Greece.[30] Many have observed

---

[29] His main theme is the world conflict, so he brings to bear upon it the history of the world in a way that is almost modern. See James T. Shotwell, *A History of History*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1938, pp. 177-213.

[30] The funeral oration was delivered by Pericles in 439 B.C. at the end of the Samian war. Thucydides wrote the oration "not in ink, but in blood" as perhaps the last thing he did. His *History* was published about 398 B.C. when the once-free Acropolis was held by a Spartan garrison and after he himself

(Footnote continued on Page 84)

the similarities between the oration of Pericles over Athens' martyred dead and Lincoln's Gettysburg address. Both have moved men to tears. Unfortunately our space will here permit but the most scanty and ineffectual abbreviation of the great oration with its message for our own day:

> It is good, that solemn words should be spoken over our fallen soldiers. Acts deserve acts, not words, in their honor. Our constitution is named a democracy, because it is in the hands not of the few but of the many. Our laws secure equal justice for all. No other city provides so many recreations for the spirit—contests and sacrifices all the year round, and beauty in our public buildings to cheer the heart and delight the eye day by day. The city is so large and powerful that all the wealth of all the world flows in to her. The gates of our city are flung open to the world. We are lovers of beauty without extravagance, and lovers of wisdom without unmanliness. Wealth to us is but an opportunity for achievement, and poverty we think it no disgrace to acknowledge but a real degradation to make no effort to overcome. Our citizens attend both to public and to private duties, and do not allow absorption in their own affairs to interfere with their knowledge of the city's.
>
> We differ from other states in regarding the man who holds aloof from public life not as "quiet" but as useless; we decide or debate, carefully and in person, all matters of policy. We are alone among mankind in doing men benefits, not on calculations of self-interest, but in the fearless confidence of freedom. In a word, I claim that our city as a whole is an education to Greece, and that her members yield to none for independence of spirit, many-sidedness of attainment, and complete self-reliance in body and brain. Our pioneers have forced a way into every sea and every land, establishing among all mankind, eternal memorials of their settlement. If I have chanted the glory of the city it was these men (who have died) who set hand to array her. Words cannot magnify the deeds they have done. For the whole earth is the sepulchre of famous men; and their story is not graven only on stone, but lives on far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives. For you now it remains to rival what they have done, knowing the secret of happiness to be

---

had been exiled for more than twenty years. He wrote of Athens as Jeremiah might have written of Jerusalem, in captivity. See Sir Alfred Zimmern, *The Greek Commonwealth,* pp. 198-209; also Gilbert Murray's *A History of Ancient Greek Literature,* New York, Appleton Century, 1910, pp. 178-202.

> freedom and the secret of freedom a brave heart. And now, when you have finished your lamentation let each of you depart. The battle which Athens has now to face is not against the Lacedaemonians (Spartans) or any hosts of armored men, but against the foe in her own household, the desires and ambitions she herself has nurtured. Shall she try to put them from her, lest they corrupt her and wreck her peace, or will they lay her glory in the dust?[31]

Yet disruption began within the internal contradictions of Greek life. In practice, the majority was always sacrificed to the privileged minority who were unwilling to share their privileges. They never recognized that they were brothers and were their brothers' keepers. As their intellectual and ethical life developed, the legends of their gods seemed to them ridiculous and revolting. Their polytheistic gods were not themselves in harmony, but in chaos and conflict. The Greeks outgrew their religion, which was destroyed by the internal evolution of their own consciousness. Unlike the Hebrews, their religious life did not keep pace with their intellectual and esthetic development. The Greeks attained the utmost limit possible for a cultural humanism, but this could not satisfy them nor preserve their civilization.

Greece failed in all the four principles which constitute our criterion of judgment. Save in such theorizing as in Plato's utopian *Republic,* the Greeks never passionately demanded nor realized justice.[32] There was little realization of brotherhood even in the individualistic jealousies among the few aristocratic citizens of one city state, while the vast majority were despised as slaves. Greece finally fell through the bitter divisions of civil war. The Greeks were never united save for a few brief years under the autocratic power of Alexander. Liberty they prized but only briefly realized before they passed under permanent bondage to Rome. Their basic lack, however, was of vital dynamic religion. Without the love of one God as the Father of all and of their neighbor as themselves, they could not unite all Greece, much less could they embrace all humanity in one brotherhood. They built not upon the rock of ethical monotheism but upon the sand of their self-centered humanism, and after a few centuries Greece ended in almost complete collapse.

---

[31] Abbreviated from the text of Pericles' Funeral Oration in Sir Alfred Zimmern's *The Greek Commonwealth,* pp. 198-209, the Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1931.

[32] Not only Greece but almost the whole ancient world was living in incredible poverty. Greek cities were so poor that the small population had to be held strictly stationary by birth control and infanticide. The Athenians lived in little more than mud huts while they built their temples to the gods in splendid marble. The city that lay at the foot of the noble Acropolis was one of houses and streets without drains, beds without sheets or springs, and rooms as cold or hot as the open air. The Athenians told the time without watches, crossed rivers without bridges, and seas without a compass. Their geography was without maps—for Europe, Asia, and Africa were all unknown continents—and their politics were without newspapers.

ALEXANDER AND THE FIRST WORLD EMPIRE

Greece had been bled white in the long Peloponnesian War (431-404 B.C.) in the jealous rivalry between Athens and Sparta and all the little city-states that had almost outlived their usefulnes so far as their narrow provincialism was concerned. The time had come when larger entities must take the place of the petty city-state, however cultured or enlightened it might be. Unconscious of any higher purpose, but providentially just at this crisis, Philip of Macedonia was preparing his hardy mountaineers and the new weapon of "the iron wall" of the Macedonian phalanx—together with charging cavalry and catapults as "artillery preparation"—which alone could conquer and unite these rival city states into a larger national unity. The hegemony of Macedonia at the head of the Greek states was to furnish the instrument in the hands of Philip's son, Alexander the Great (356-323 B.C.), for bridging the agelong gulf between jealous, warring, and divided nations, and even between the Orient and Occident. He was an unconscious instrument to unite all known nations in *one world* for the spread first of Hellenic culture and then of the Hebraic-Christian religion over all the earth. Three of the major steps toward world unity were taken, first through the conquests and empire of Alexander, then through the instrumentality of Rome, and finally in our own day, out of the jealous anarchy of "sovereign" states—as sovereign and almost as jealous and as blind as Athens and Sparta—in the effort to organize the world for peace first at Geneva and then at San Francisco, in a United Nations Organization. Twenty-three centuries ago the world was being prepared for all this through Alexander.

It was symbolic and providential that Alexander was tutored by Aristotle, who combined, more than any other, the gathered wisdom of Greece. He emphasized the two principles of conquest and synthesis, as did Alexander himself throughout his military and cultural career. Both had a passion for unity. It was symbolic that throughout his campaigns, Alexander carried with him a prized copy of the Iliad, annotated by Aristotle, which he placed beside his dagger under his pillow at night—typifying culture and force. Upon the death of his father, when Alexander seized his empire at the age of twenty, no ruler had ever faced the world with such a rare combination of gifts. Handsome, brave, brilliant, yet truthful, generous and lovable, he was the idol of his soldiers. He swiftly crushed a dozen factions in Macedonia itself and then raised it to the headship of the Greek states which he conquered, yet wisely left each city free and autonomous. With a small force of thirty thousand infantry and five thousand cavalry in 334 B.C., Alexander crossed the Hellespont into Asia and completely conquered the Persian host. Later he defeated some six hundred thousand Persians under Darius III at Issus.

For eleven years Alexander advanced and never returned to Greece. He was intoxicated in battle and loved to lead the charge in person, heedless of impossibilities. Able to quote the Iliad almost by heart, he made pilgrimage to ancient Troy and then advanced swiftly in his conquests to Damascus, Sidon, Tyre, and Jerusalem. He passed the desert of Sinai to Egypt and laid out plans for the new capital of Alexandria—one of seventeen Alexandrias that he founded—as a center of culture throughout the coming centuries. He conquered the vast host of Darius at Arbela and pressed on to Babylon, ancient Susa, and rich Persepolis. In 327 he scaled the Himalayas, entered India, and defeated King Porus. Returning through Baluchistan to Persia, with his lifelong passion for unity, he placed all Greeks and Persians on an equal footing. He was the first human being who tried to unite Europe and Asia, the Occident and the Orient. He hellenized Asiatic cities and had thirty thousand Persian youths educated on Greek lines as future leaders. He had still unrealized dreams of further conquests in Arabia and backward, barbarous Europe when death cut him short in his youth. He had wellnigh conquered the known world, but he never conquered himself. He had increasing paroxisms of cruelty, which he had inherited from his barbarian mother, and growingly frequent fits of drunkenness. Following ten days of fever, after a drinking bout in Babylon, he died in 323 B.C. as a youth of thirty-three. At his death he was about the same age as a young Galilean carpenter who, three centuries later, was to begin his brief work of proclaiming an eternal spiritual kingdom of love—of peace on earth and good will among men. If God is in history perhaps both were being used to prepare the world for a better future.

The tragic faults and failures of Alexander's life are obvious to all, yet his achievement was immense and in part permanent. He ended the system of petty city states that had outlived their usefulness and aimed to unify Greece and the world. He conceived of larger and more effective political systems that were to be more fully realized by Rome. With all Alexander's vanity, his tragic faults and failures, he strove to break down the barriers between Greeks and barbarians, to remove the estrangement between the Occident and the Orient, and to open the way for a cosmopolitan Hellenic age.

He conceived of the moral unity of mankind when his great tutor, Aristotle, counted all non-Greeks, especially all Asiatics, as slaves by nature. He united the eastern Mediterranean world and brought Greek literature, philosophy, and art to Asia. Because God was in history, even in this vain young genius, he opened highways for the passage of Hellenic culture from the West to the East and for Hebraic religion to pass from the East to the West. Henceforth the all-important contact between Hellenism and Hebraism was close and continuous. Alexander brought the light of Athens to the world and prepared the way for the Light of the World to be carried to the ends of the earth. Even stark Hebrew religion had to be modified and interpreted through Greek thought in cosmopolitan and universal terms; and the Apostle Paul, a Jew who spoke Greek over the Roman world, represented in himself a synthesis of the Hebrew, Greek, and Roman cultures which Alexander the Great had unwittingly prepared.

The way had been made ready for that religion which, at its best, has called East and West to the unity of one world in the spirit of brotherhood. Robert Flint in *The Philosophy of History in Europe,* concludes: "There is reason to believe that no single idea of special value struck out by the Greek or Roman mind was permanently lost in consequence of the temporary anarchy caused by the success of the barbarians, and certainly that no truth of Christianity was lost" (Vol. I, p. 54).

If Amos could see Assyria as God's instrument, and Jeremiah could believe that Babylon was his battle-axe, if Isaiah was sure that Cyrus was God's anointed, can we not believe, if there is any meaning in history at all, that God was at work in the life of Alexander in the very mid-current of history? Let us remember also that the culture of Athens, though never equaled, was never lost. The despair of twenty centuries, it may yet be the heritage of the earth. Athens was not only "the education of Greece," but of the world. For the culture of Greece was part of God's education of man, as was the religion of Judea and the government of Rome. The Greeks had contributed certain structural ideas to modern man. By the dissemination of writing—discovered in Sumeria—they developed the idea of universal knowledge, of universal history, of universal philosophy and the beginnings of universal science. They had conceived of a world polity and the political organization of mankind as one. From Judea they were to learn the service of one universal God of righteousness and the possibility of one world religion. But only the union of Hebraism and Hellenism—neither in itself complete or self-sufficient—could make possible one world organized for peace and the good life, the abundant life, ultimately available for all men.

5. The Roman Synthesis

However brilliant the cultural achievements of the Greeks and the religious attainments of the Hebrews, it was imperative that some nation should learn the art of government and the attainment of social stability, law, and order, if civilization was to survive. This was the achievement and contribution of the Roman synthesis, which gathered together the great cultures and civilizations of the world and made the lessons of history available for all men and for posterity. We shall note the rise of Rome from a little agricultural crossroads town to world mastery. We see a tiny city-state less than twenty miles square, fortified on its seven ridges or hills, finally building the "eternal city," with a population of over a million in 189 B.C., and the early Roman Empire, according to Gibbon,[33] with 120,000,000.

In 1936 Rome celebrated the twenty-six hundred and eighty-ninth anniversary of her foundation and could look back upon the most massive and continuous civilization in the history of mankind. Napoleon's empire was closely analogous to that of Rome, but it lasted only through three campaigning seasons from 1810 to 1812, while Rome maintained itself over many centuries. We may well ask with Polybius "to know by what means and under what kind of polity the Romans, in less than fifty-three years, have succeeded in subjugating the whole inhabited world to their sole government—a thing unexampled in history?" Polybius rightly attributed this to the honest character of the Romans, their loyal citizenship, their sound constitution, and their wise statesmanship. We shall watch Rome in the hour of its proud triumph when Caesar and Christ stood face to face in Pilate's judgment hall, and then through the centuries of its slow decay and downfall, as the handful of hunted fugitives of Jesus' followers became heirs of the greatest empire in history and came later to number a third of the population of the world.

---

[33] Gibbon's *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,* New York, Bigelow Brown, I, 42. In 1937 the population of the city of Rome was 1,178,000. We are indebted throughout this section to the Cambridge Ancient History, Volumes VII to XII, to W. W. Fowler's Gifford Lectures of 1911 on *The Religious Experience of the Roman People,* New York, Macmillan, to T. R. Glover's *The Ancient World,* New York, Macmillan, 1935, and most of all to Durant's *Caesar and Christ, a History of Roman Civilization,* New York, Simon and Schuster, 1944.

Rome was the youngest of the five civilizations we have been studying. It was about 509 B.C., according to the reckoning of the historian, Livy, when an assembly of citizen-soldiers chose, instead of a king, two consuls, Brutus and Callatinus, to rule over their first primitive republic.[34] This first revolution replaced the monarchy of the earlier kings with an aristocracy that was to rule Rome until Caesar. One of the two consuls was a "friend of the people," who helped pass basic laws that any man who tried to make himself king might be executed without trial. The fathers, or patricians of the various clans, furnished Rome for five centuries with her generals, consuls, and laws, and gave the world more than two centuries of peace. When the three original clans united, their clan heads organized a senate of some three hundred members. The importance of Rome for us is that in it we are studying our own early history, long before the Magna Carta. The history of Rome seems strangely modern in her long struggle with barbarism without and corruption within. The continuous class war between patricians and plebeians, the rich and the poor, is repeated in our own economic history. The wealth of early Rome seemed fabulous to an impoverished world, but the total revenue of the Empire was only $150,000,000 under Vespasian—or less than a fifth of the budget of New York City today.

---

[34] *Cambridge Ancient History,* Vol. VII, pp. 320-321.

The character of the Roman people was orderly, conservative, loyal, sober, tenacious, severe, and supremely practical. The educated Roman, in contrast to the more versatile and volatile Greek, was characterized by a vast sagacity and by rigid discipline, where order was counted more important than liberty. He had a sense of what was essential and was tolerant in all else. In many ways his tough fiber resembled that of the modern British, and together the Romans and the British—however unpopular—were the supremely wise imperial rulers across the centuries. Both sought to maintain the delicate balance between freedom and order, both avoided the extremes of tyranny and anarchy, both established a rule of laws rather than of men, and both allowed for a large measure of liberty and progress among their colonies and conquered peoples, both distrusted extreme individualism, erratic genius, irresponsible speculation and abstract philosophy. Both permitted continuous evolution so that their subjects were seldom driven to violent revolution. Neither was a mere police state.

The Romans felt that the government had a right to command obedience, levy taxes, inquire into a man's morals and his value to the state. They admired character and strong will as the Greek admired freedom and intellect. The Roman "could not, for the life of him, understand Plato, or Archimedes, or Christ. He could only rule the world." Organization, government, and law were his forte. While the Greek virtues were wisdom, courage, temperance, and justice, the Roman's stoic virtues were piety, gravity, and simplicity. As the Greeks left us philosophy, culture, democracy, and the passion for individual liberty, Rome left us its laws and its masterly administration as the basis of enduring social order.

From 146 B.C. to 192 A.D., great jurists shaped the Roman constitution, like the British, with no binding written instrument, by a stream of precedent, giving general direction without preventing change, and continuously adapting it to their ever-modified environment. The Romans were neither creatively artistic, nor highly intellectual, nor deeply religious. Their artists were Greek slaves or freedmen, and their deepest religious teachers were Jews. Before Augustus, Roman citizens were warriors; after him they were rulers. Law, politics, and agriculture were counted worthy occupations. The Romans built like giants—roads, monuments, and institutions for the world. Rome was founded on the family, the state, and a stern early religion, which made for morality and strengthened the individual, the family, and the state.

In place of the now unwieldy Macedonian phalanx, Rome created the more efficient legion of rapid manœuver and iron discipline. The young Roman was educated for war from childhood; the Republic sometimes lost battles but never lost a war.

If Pericles was the typical Athenian, the very genius of Rome was incarnate in Julius Caesar (100-44). Like Alexander, he was destined to play a part in universal history for the weal or woe of multitudes. By birth and training he inherited the best culture of Greece and the highest civilization of Rome. In his early years he seemed an unscrupulous politician and reckless rake, but he was "transformed by growth and responsibility into one of history's most profound and conscientious statesmen."[35] Reckoned as second only to Cicero in eloquence, he became, not by words, but by deeds, the maker and remaker of Rome. He served all over the empire and held almost all the principal offices, including that of *Pontifex Maximus,* as head of the Roman religion. He distributed state lands to the poorer citizens as their champion. To bring the Senate under the judgment of public opinion, he established the equivalent of the first newspaper and published the "Daily Doings" of the Senate and its voting record in the forum where he delighted to expose cheap politicians. He conquered Gaul, had it proclaimed a Roman province, and then wrote his historic *Commentaries.* He laid the foundations of later French civilization which was derived from Rome and which long led the continent of Europe before the awakening of the more barbarous Britons and Teutons.

---

[35] William Durant, *Story of Civilization,* New York, Simon and Schuster, 1944, Vol. 3, *Caesar and Christ,* p. 169.

For three hundred years, while Gaul remained a Roman province, it learned and transformed the Latin language, and became the base and channel through which the culture of classic antiquity passed to northern Europe. Providentially Caesar invaded backward and barbarous Britain and placed it under the discipline of Roman civilization. When he returned to Italy, Rome was amazed to find the now disciplined Julius a tireless administrator and resourceful general. The historian, Mommsen, wrote:

> . . . that there is a bridge connecting the past glory of Hellas and Rome with the prouder fabric of modern history, that western Europe is Romanic, and German Europe classic. . . . All this is the work of Caesar; and while the work of his great predecessor in the East (Alexander) has been almost wholly reduced to ruin by the tempests of the Middle Ages, the structure of Caesar has outlasted those thousands of years which have changed religions and states.[36]

During Caesar's absence in Gaul, Roman politics had become a sink of corruption and violence. Everything was for sale to the highest bidder. There was no democracy, no rule of law to which Julius could hand over power. The government had now to be one of men—or of one man—or chaos. The poorer classes awaited the return of Caesar as their one hope. Unemployment, bribery, free bread, and circusses had corrupted the Senate and the Assembly. The Republic was a corpse.

---

[36] H. H. Mommsen, *History of Rome,* New York, E. P. Dutton and Co., 1911, Vol. V, p. 100.

Caesar delayed his return to Italy and made every effort at conciliation with Pompey and the Senate. He laid the situation before his "fellow soldiers" of his trusted Thirteenth Legion, every one of whom stood with him as he crossed the Rubicon on his return to Rome. He finally defeated Pompey and united Italy and the Empire as the champion of Italian rights. Caesar was never a saint, but we have found that God's use of men in history is not confined to saints; for the children of this world are often wiser than the children of light.

The rule of a corrupt Roman oligarchy and a century of revolution had disorganized agriculture, industry, finance, trade, and government. At the age of fifty-five, Caesar set himself to remake the Roman State. He provided work for the unemployed, not by Rome's boasted "free enterprise" but by a great public building program. He built or rebuilt cities in Italy, Spain, Gaul, and Greece. As an agnostic he was high priest of the cold state religion and vainly tried as a rational humanist to vitalize it. He reformed the calendar, designed public libraries, sought the freeing of Rome from malaria by drainage, flood control for the Tiber, and the extension of citizenship to all free adult males of the Empire. As the most complete man that antiquity ever produced, he had become "one of the ablest, bravest, fairest, and most enlightened men in all the sorry annals of politics."[37] Compared to him Alexander was a riotous youth.

When Caesar was convinced that disorder and empire had made monarchy inevitable, the Senate, fearing their own extinction, plotted his assassination, though not one of his murderers had the ability or moral character to succeed him or to save Rome. The assassination of Caesar seems one of the major tragedies of history, as it led to fifteen years of chaos and war. Yet Caesar's wise foresight had chosen and trained to succeed him his adopted son, the young Octavian, later Augustus, then eighteen years old. As the greatest statesman in Roman history, Augustus was to carry out the creative reforms of Julius. At thirty-one Augustus was master of the world, ruler of Rome for half a century, and architect of the greatest empire of ancient times. The great Roman Emperors furnished the finest role of rulers in all history: Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, and Constantine– founder of Constantinople, the second Rome, which for more than a thousand years was "the safeguard of the West," the protector of backward Europe from barbarism and Islam, from the Hun, and Turk, and Slav.

---

[37] *Caesar and Christ,* p. 194.

Of all the emperors of Rome, Augustus was the first and the most renowned. Though lacking the genius and generalship of Julius, he was one of the world's great men and one of the most able statesmen of all time. Gaius Julius Caesar Octavianus (63 B.C.-A.D. 14) at the age of nineteen, upon the assassination of Julius, stretched out a firm hand to grasp the empire which he alone was fitted and destined to rule. The genius of Julius had sketched in bold strokes a world empire of which Augustus was first to draw the blueprint and then to build. Rome had conquered and was now to reshape the world–through Augustus. Augustus felt the imperative call of destiny to establish the empire and then to work tirelessly with utter self-sacrifice for the next sixty years for the maximum achievement of the good life for every citizen of that empire, "as savior and father." After Mark Antony's dalliance with Cleopatra for five years, the disciplined young Octavian's victory at Actium in 31 B.C. left him master of the world.

Because of the Augustan peace, the temple of Janus was closed for the first time in two hundred years. Augustus' primal task was to restore constitutional government, preserving all the possible values of the virile republic. He then spent forty years, working almost day and night, driving his frail body in reorganizing all the provinces of the East and West and then every branch of the public service–the army, public works, finance, taxation, and the civil service which he created. No detail was too small for his personal attention. By slow evolution he shaped the unwritten constitution of Rome as a new thing, neither republic nor empire, where sovereignty derived from the people and power was delegated to the magistrates. As one of his most lasting reforms, for the first time in Roman history, government became expert and professional.[38]

As a great humanist Augustus earnestly worked toward not only political reforms, but moral and religious regeneration for Rome. He set himself to revive the state religion in order to restore the old morality. As Pontifex Maximus, leader of both church and state, he tried to bolster the state with unpopular and almost puritan morals. Yet in the spiritual sphere Augustus was impotent, despite the fact that all the religions and philosophies of the world flowed into Rome. Stoicism, which was best suited to the Roman temperament, was a kind of puritanism stripped of its element of rapture and personal religion. But the best and greatest of the Stoics, the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, could only write of human life: "What is the end of it all? Smoke and ashes and a legend —or scarcely a legend."[39]

Augustus was a fatalist who believed in some divine power that governed the world, but he had not found that power. In the words of John Buchan, Augustus saw on all hands "beneath the skepticism and indifference a great longing. He saw all the materials for a religious revival." But apart from Christianity there was for this no creative and dynamic center and source. Hence John Buchan concludes:

> Among the educated there was the desire for a new thing

---

[38] On wheaten porridge, the Roman legions ruled with simplicity and economy the provinces of the East and West, and twelve hundred men at Lyons kept order throughout the whole of Gaul. Gibbon wrote: "If a man were called to fix the period in the history of the world during which the condition of the human race was most happy and prosperous, he would without hesitation name that which elapsed from the death of Domitian to the accession of Commodus. The vast extent of the Roman Empire was governed by arbitrary power, under the guidance of virtue and wisdom." *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (ed. Bury), I, 78.

[39] *Meditations,* V, 33.

> which might give them what they missed in the state cults, a personal religion, a closer link with the unseen. . . . What men craved for was not a doctrine but a revelation. . . . [The cults] involved no new vision of the universe, no radical transformation of the soul. . . . Their loneliness and disquiet were a *preparatio evangelica* opening a path for a new revelation.[40]

The world was looking for a Messiah. From the Golden Mile Stone in the Forum set up by Augustus in 20 B.C., which bore the names of the chief cities of the empire and their distance from the capital, radiated like the spokes of a wheel the great Roman roads that led over the known world North, South, East, and West. The Empire seemed ready and waiting for the new gospel. While Quirinius was Governor of Syria, Augustus had ordered a census for the purpose of taxation in 6 or 7 B.C., when Jesus of Nazareth was born. When the great, but now helpless, Augustus lay dying in 14 A.D., Jesus was working in a carpenter shop in Galilee:

> Sixteen years later he was to proclaim a kingdom mightier than the Roman, and to tell of a world saved not by Man who became God, but by God who became Man. Christianity brought a Savior and a promise of immortality. It carried on the Platonic teaching that this earthly life was sacramental, a shadow of eternity. It had its rites but also its philosophy. It gave freedom from sin, knowledge of the truth, an armour against fate, a discipline of life. Moreover it used the language of every race and class and clime.[41]

Augustus, this man of "iron self-command, infinite patience, and an infallible judgment of facts and men," had for more than sixty years been building up and uniting the empire and its great highways over the known world, which gave Christianity its supreme opportunity for the next three centuries. The Athenian Empire lasted for fifty years and the stupendous creation of Alexander the Great for less. The Empire of Spain endured on the grand scale for little more than a century; that of Napoleon for scarcely a decade; the

---

[40] John Buchan's *Augustus,* Hodder & Stoughton, 1942, London, England, pp. 281-283.

[41] *Ibid.* pp. 285, 346.

British Empire is less than two centuries old. Only the Augustan Empire reached a venerable age and, in the words of Buchan, it helps us to grasp the meaning of history:

> In the coming of Christianity it had to face the greatest of all historic convulsions, but such was its potency that it weathered the storm and influenced profoundly the organization of the Christian Church. The true achievement of Augustus is that he saved the world from disintegration. . . . Without him the great traditions of Hellas and Palestine would have been choked by debris, the night of the Dark Ages would have fallen sooner, and our civilization today would have lacked its most precious spiritual foundations. He gave the world a new and rational way of life.[42]

In 14 A.D., the able Tiberias succeeded Augustus. Before he was assassinated as "an old and lonely man," the Galilean carpenter was "crucified under Pontius Pilate" on a hill outside the walls of turbulent Jerusalem. A generation later the historian Tacitus thus tells of the despicable Nero seeking the Christians as a scapegoat for the fire of Rome on July 18, 64 A.D.:

> A race of men detested for their evil practices, and commonly called *Chrestiani*. The name was derived from Chrestus, who, in the reign of Tiberius, suffered under Pontius Pilate, Procurator of Judea. By that event the sect of which he was the founder received a blow which for a time checked the growth of a dangerous superstition; but it revived soon after, and spread with recruited vigor not only in Judea . . . but even in the city of Rome. . . . [The Christians] were put to death with exquisite cruelty, and to their sufferings Nero added mockery and derision. Some were covered with skins of wild beasts, and left to be devoured by dogs; others were nailed to crosses, numbers of them were burned alive; many, covered with inflammable matter, were set on fire to serve as torches during the night. . . . At length the brutality of these measures filled every breast with pity. Humanity relented in favor of the Christians.[43]

Within a few years after the fire of Rome some lost letters of a tentmaker of Tarsus were collected and three small books or pamphlets appeared by obscure writers called Mark, Matthew, and Luke, which were to outlive Tacitus and the Roman Caesars, and were to shape and mold the new world.

---

[42] *Ibid.* 351, 354.

[43] Tacitus, XV, 44.

The Parthenon and many pagan Roman temples finally became Christian churches where there gathered to worship in the midst of the decaying empire "a new race of men." One writer of the second century says that what the soul is to the body, Christians are to the world. With all their sins, these churches in Philippi, Thessalonica, Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome became the most living thing in the world and the most life-giving. One writer during the persecution of Domitian in 95 A.D. had an apocalyptic vision of the future: "The rule of the world has passed to our Lord and his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever." Thus Rome fell, but not the spiritual Kingdom that Jesus proclaimed under Tiberias.

In the fullness of time Paul of Tarsus, by birth a Roman citizen, speaking Greek as an inheritor of Hellenic culture, yet a Hebrew of Hebrews, as he traveled by land and sea over the Empire, was able to realize the great synthesis of Rome in himself. As the first Christian theologian he interpreted the Incarnation, the Atonement, and the Resurrection of Christ as the head of the Body, the Church invisible, which united all the little scattered Christian communities from Jesusalem to Rome. Despite their obvious limitations as heirs of all the ages the spiritual communities were to realize the major purposes gathered in the mid-current of our civilization from Ur, Egypt, Palestine, Greece and Rome, in the great synthesis of life spiritually centered in Christ:

> For all belongs to you; Paul (of Roman Tarsus), Apollos (of Alexander's Alexandria), Cephas (of Jewish Galilee), the world, life, death, the present and the future—all belongs to you; and you belong to Christ, and Christ to God.

Arnold Toynbee shows that man has been reaching out toward the concept of the unity of mankind and toward peace on earth in a universal brotherhood for more than four thousand years. The Sumerian King, Dungi, claimed title to "the Kingdom of the Four Quarters," as did the Incas in their universal Andean empire much later. The Eleventh Egyptian Dynasty tried to unite its little cosmos, and Iknaton's hymn to Aton expressed the idea of the brotherhood of all mankind through the common beneficence of God. The ruler of the Syriac world took the title King of Kings. In the illustrious Han Dynasty of China, more than two thousand years ago, they conceived of a universal state of "All that is under Heaven," and all within the four seas were counted brothers. Alexander was the first to begin to give reality to the conception of one united world embracing East and West and his dream of world unity continued to haunt Hellenic peoples ever afterward. Yet a "savior with the sword" could not realize his *Pax Oecumenica* nor unite the world by force. The dream of Alexander was realized more concretely in the Roman Empire which became a symbol in its passion for political unity and perpetual peace. Toynbee believes that the ecumenical rulers, Cyrus, Alexander, and Augustus were touched with some pity for the sufferings of their fellow men and had in measure caught the vision of a great unity which Terence implied when he wrote: "I am a man and nothing human is foreign to me." Toynbee concludes:

> The unity of mankind is a goal which men can attain by way of the common fatherhood of God and, Paul would add, through the new revelation of the common brotherhood of Christ, but not through any exclusively human endeavors in which God's leading part is left out of the reckoning.[44]

Like Sumeria, Egypt, and Greece, Rome was not conquered from without until it had destroyed itself from within. Continuing in stubborn persistence Rome was in process of decline for three hundred years because of growing luxury and vice, the decaying morals of her people, her class struggle which never gave justice to the poor, her falling trade, her bureaucratic despotism—drunk with the absolute power that corrupts absolutely—her stifling taxes and her consuming wars. Tertullian, about 200 A.D., saw the end of an era, while Cyprian in 250 said that the world had grown old.

---

[44] A. Toynbee's *A Study of History*, Oxford Press, 1939, Vol. VI, pp. 1-10.

It remained for Augustus to explain the fall of the city of Rome and tell of the rise of the eternal City of God. Despite all her sins, Rome won the Mediterranean world, adopted its culture and gave it order, prosperity, and peace for two hundred years. It held back the barbarian horde for two centuries more and then transmitted the classic heritage—of Sumeria, Egypt, Palestine, and Greece—to the West and to the world. Successfully uniting monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, Rome had taught the world the art of government. Her language, when modified, became the speech of Italy, Rumania, France, Spain, Portugal, and Latin America, till almost half the white world spoke in Latin tongues. Today we write our medical prescriptions and form the phraseology of our law in Latin. Latin survives as the ritual of the world-wide Roman Church, which took over the title and vestments of the *Pontifex Maximus,* the worship of the Great Mother, and many classic pagan customs. Upon our languages, our laws, our forms of thought and our ethical principles were left the lasting influence of the Roman synthesis.

In a sense Rome never died—for history never dies. Even when she fell, out of the early vigor of Spain and Gaul and long-backward Britain, a new civilization arose where the Roman legions had brought the beginning of the light of Greece and the law of Rome. Greece and Rome not only made Christianity possible but almost inevitable. After a thousand years of trial, classic Greco-Roman civilization had broken down. Humanity needed a new birth "from above." St. Augustine finds this in the eternal *City of God.* After his vain quest in all the philosophy and religion of Greece and Rome, he finds at last the Lord of History.

SUMMARY: OUR INHERITANCE OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION

When we realize our immeasurable debt to the five principal cultures that have formed what we call the mid-current of Western civilization—the Sumerian, Egyptian, Hebraic, Hellenic, and Roman—we are not tempted to boast that we moderns are self-made men. Rather we are constrained to say with Paul: "What do you possess that has not been given you? And if it was given you why do you boast as if it had been gained, not given?" We have seen that from Sumeria we received the art of writing and the first high achievements of city civilization. From Egypt we received the early development of conscience, of high intelligence and education; from the Hebrews our ethical monotheism as the only possible rational basis of a world religion; from the Greeks the core of our intellectual and esthetic culture and our passion for democracy; from Rome, our achievement of law, order, and government and our political sagacity.

CHAPTER IV

TOWARD A PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

---

1. The Biblical Philosophy of History

In the Jewish view of history, God rewards the righteous and punishes the wicked. God created the world and is running it. Man succeeds by obeying God's will. The prophets declare God's will and condemn the people for transgressing it. The writers of the Old and New Testaments were not philosophers as were the Greeks. Nevertheless they held a more realistic view of history than the Greeks ever did, for the latter saw no meaning in history. The authors of this religious library of sixty-six books which constitute the Bible differed widely in their views. They were in agreement, however, on what seemed to them the central certainty that God was working effectively in history, even more than sinful man was marring it, and that his mighty purposes would in the end be realized. The nature of his unfolding purpose was only gradually disclosed under the Old Covenant and then more fully under the New. In both, the culmination of history was in the Kingdom of God, variously interpreted as within history and beyond it.

There were three main periods or phases in the Biblical philosophy of history: the prophetic, the apocalyptic, and the Christian philosophy of history of the New Testament writers. In all three God was conceived as working both in nature and in history as the instruments of his purpose. The first clear philosophy of history of which we have record appears in the literary prophets. These mark a new epoch, both in the history of religion and of literature, and usher in the greatest movement in the spiritual history of mankind. Amos strikes the keynote for all the prophets on that great day for religion when at Bethel, about 750 B.C., he chanted before the vast assembly the funeral song of Israel: "The virgin of Israel is fallen." The Eternal's demand of righteousness is universal; he is the God of the whole earth. There had been nothing approaching such a philosophy of history in Ur, Egypt, Greece, or Rome.

Isaiah becomes for forty years God's spokesman to Judah in the South (738-700 B.C.). Isaiah sees God directing all the movements of history as he unfolds his plan in the events of the nations. He foretells a revolution in Judah which is to be the judgment of Yahweh. He calls on Ahaz to trust God as the sole director of the affairs of men. God will judge Assyria, whom he uses temporarily as his club and rod to discipline Israel. He will shift the boundaries of the nations, raising up the Medes and Persians against Babylon and he will judge Assyria and Egypt, as he says: "I will punish the world for its evil," for his "judgments bring men light." But Zion shall be the hope "for all nations."[1]

2. St. Augustine's Philosophy of History

St. Augustine was the first to construct a Christian philosophy of history and to produce a classic work on the subject for Western Christendom. He sees a divine all-ruling providence as the principle of unity and purpose in the world. All his life had seemed to him a series of accidents, which, when looked back upon, appeared to be a chain of providences in a divine plan. As God guides individuals, so he seems to overrule nations and peoples, calling them to serve his purpose. Amos had held that God had led both the Israelites and the Philistines; the Prophet of the Exile had declared that Cyrus was God's shepherd; Daniel saw a scheme of world events; Paul proclaimed at Athens a God of the nations and of history. Augustine is, however, the first thinker seriously to undertake a philosophy of history in his *Civitas Dei,* or *City of God.*

---

[1] "Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone of sure foundation. . . . That he may do his work, his strange work, and bring to pass his act, his strange act. . . . For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. . . . Upon the throne of David and upon his Kingdom to establish it." (Isaiah 2^{2-4}, 9^{2-7}, 11^{6-10}, 28^{7-22}).

The Latin *civitas* has no local meaning and corresponds to our organized community, commonwealth, or nation. Augustine uses it interchangeably to designate the city of Rome, or the new Jerusalem coming down from heaven, or the Roman Empire, or the godless world, or the divine Kingdom of God, embracing the Church Militant and Triumphant. Everywhere he sees two communities in conflict: Christianity and secularism, or the City of God and the city of the wicked world, representing the two principles of good and evil. One is motivated by the love of God, the other by the love of self, or sin. Thus Augustine sees all history as the struggle between the principles of faith and unbelief.

Christ and his Church are opposed to Rome. Yet Rome was the head of the earthly community, "by which God was pleased to conquer the world, bringing it into one fellowship of government and laws." Thus God was concerned not only with the redeemed Church but with the sinful State. Citizens of the "Divine City" are those who do the will of God, while those of the "Earthly City" are devoted to worldly concerns; through pride and self-love, they have turned from God, and they usually sink down into corruption, especially in decaying Rome. Throughout the world there are then two classes: "Those who live according to God and those who live according to man." In Rome, these were represented by the Church of Christ and the pagan world.

But for Augustine, both the church and the world are within the plan of God: "Behold then the goodness and the severity of God," who makes even the wrath of man to praise him, who makes his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and uses in his divine purpose both the good and the evil. Augustine repudiates the theory of cycles or repetitive patterns in history held by the early Greek philosophers. Under a sovereign God, man is responsible, with limited freedom, free to do good by the grace of God, or free to do almost boundless evil. Therefore history is marked by a sure, if unsteady, advance to God's ultimate goal. On the whole, in Augustine's view, the world is getting better, for the Catholic Church and Christendom will take the place of fallen Rome.

Augustine himself tells us of the occasion of writing his *City of God*. Two years after the sack of the Imperial City (A.D. 410)—which the Catholic clergy heralded as the approaching end of the world, and which pagan writers attributed to the Christians because of the neglect of the country's gods—Augustine began to answer the latter's charges. A group of pagans and Christians had been debating the relative merits of Christianity and the old religion of Rome. The pagan Volusianus challenged the Christians to show how, if Christians were absolute pacifists who must "turn the other cheek" and offer no resistance, either Rome or any other state could be preserved from invasion or anarchy. A Christian, Marcellinus, reported the debate to Augustine, who answered the pagan charge in a letter which proved to be the text and germ of his great apologetic, *The City of God,* whose twenty-two long books he wrote during the next fourteen years, from 412 to 426.

In his letter of reply to Marcellinus, Augustine shows that Christianity is not opposed to national defense in a righteous war; that Christian principles, instead of disintegrating the State, were its only safeguard. The city's ruin had been caused by the corruption and immorality of its own citizens under the old religion, and the Cross was now the only hope of Rome or of the world. In the second book of his *Retractions,* (c.XLIII), Augustine himself describes his object in writing *The City of God:*

After the storming and the sack of Rome by the Goths under their king, Alaric, the worshippers of false gods or heathen, as we call them, tried to prove that this calamity was due to the Christian religion, and began more fiercely and bitterly than ever to blaspheme the true God. This it was that kindled my zeal for the House of God, and induced me to defend the City of God against the calumny and misrepresentations of her foes. After many serious interruptions this great undertaking, which was extended over many years, was at length finished in twenty-two books. Of these, the first five are written in answer to those who believe that worldly prosperity is insured by the old polytheistic religion of Rome, and that calamities have followed by reason of its neglect. The next five are addressed to those who admit that the human race is always exposed to such misfortunes, and yet believe that the old religion is a good preparation for the life to come; . . . while the last twelve books of this extensive work are devoted to a comparison of the different origins, histories, and destinies of the City of God and the City of the World.

On August 28, 1930, the fifteenth centenary of St. Augustine's death was celebrated; it was widely recognized that he had left a more profound impress upon the human soul in the Western world than any other during the Christian Era, save the Apostle Paul. He had contributed more to the essence, the definition, and the theological substance of Christianity than anyone else since New Testament times. He was the creative figure of the Catholic Church and the chief architect of the Middle Ages.

William James calls Augustine the first modern man. In a sense this is true, although this might be said of Socrates, of Aristotle, or of Jesus, of Luther, or Galileo, according to the point of view. But upon a first perusal of Augustine's vast tome, it strikes us today as anything but modern. He no sooner states a thesis about the City of God than he wanders into long digressions about angels and demons and a personal Devil, about all the philosophies of Greece and Rome, all the heresies of his own or past times, and all the history of the world. Written in crowded hours over a space of fourteen years of busy life, like Paul's Epistles, *The City of God* presents at first sight a confused mass of excellent materials combined with trivial matters that make up an encyclopædia of the human knowledge of that day and give us a mental picture of the fifth century. That is part of its value; and it is encouraging to see how far the modern world has advanced since that time. Augustine is a literalist in interpreting infallible Scriptures—an historic Adam, the flood and Noah's Ark with its exact dimensions. "Not 6,000 years have yet passed," writes Augustine, "since the creation" (XII:c.10). Here Augustine follows Eusebius who reckons 5,611 years from the Creation to the fall of Rome. Often Augustine is much less modern than Paul who frequently seems to be our spiritual contemporary.

Augustine attempts the first great Christian synthesis of experience in thought and life, where Plato had failed to achieve such a synthesis eight centuries before. Plato had sought the keystone of the broken arch of his system in an abstract idea of ideas, the Form of the Good—the One. In his treatment of transcendence, Plato had never found God, or the Absolute, which lies in an unknowable realm "beyond all existence"; in his problem of immanence, he had never found "a God who is near." It was quite fatal when Plato identified reality with the inaccessible and unprovable transcendent pattern, or Idea, and identified illusion and error with sense perception and the material world. Underneath Plato's whole abstract system of ideas and his unprovable hypothesis, there lurked a host of demons and all the superstitions of Greek polytheism.[2]

This was the best that the reason of man could do, including the finest minds of Greek culture. After a thousand years of trial, classical culture had broken down and had culminated in the fall of Rome, long after it had failed in Greece. Augustine had found at last the only principle upon which a satisfying philosophy of history could be based—ethical monotheism. In place of Plato's three abstract principles—the true, the beautiful, and the good—Augustine finds a Triune God who is transcendent, immanent, and redemptive in history; a God creating, redeeming, and indwelling; God the Father revealed in his unique Son, acting by his Spirit in the world—God in history. In Augustine's mighty synthesis, at last the promise both of Hebraism and Hellenism could be realized. All that Plato had dreamed, all that Paul had agonized for, were now his in Christ. Decayed Greece and fallen Rome were the answer of history to the philosophy and religion of paganism. But for Augustine the meaning of history was found in God-in-Christ. He had received a kingdom that could not be shaken. He had found Truth, Goodness, and Beauty, incarnate in man, as the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

---

[2] See Charles N. Cochrane's excellent treatment of Plato and Augustine in *Christianity and Classical Culture,* Oxford Press, 1944, pp. 380-420.

3. Hegel and His Influence

We have ten centuries of silence concerning the philosophy of history to account for after Augustine, whose synthesis, supported by Thomas Aquinas, held the field during a long millennium. Yet no permanent peace was possible between the unmodified Jewish and Greek views of life. The prevailing view of Greek philosophy was spiritual, rationalistic, and humanistic. It is difficult to reconcile it with the view that God is the sole creator, or that he is active in history. The Hebrew view was unphilosophic, nondualistic, and sought to find the will of God by his revelation in nature, history, and the prophets.

The Renaissance destroyed the frail synthesis of Augustine by releasing the ego of man which proceeded to blossom in philosophy, art, and science. Luther, who sought to recapture the Biblical view, rescued only a God who saved the individual soul, and turned the world over to princes and technicians. Both the Renaissance and the Lutheran Reformation failed to find God as a creative power in history. Luther discerned the work of the Devil in the wicked world, and humanism interpreted the physical world agnostically, as at best the result of a neutral power which man, through knowledge, might manipulate to his own ends. This is the prevailing view of science today and of many unthinking religious people as well. God is left to deal only with men's souls. This is the background against which we must estimate the significance of Hegel's philosophy of history.

The life of Hegel and the spirit of his age explain in part his philosophical system of absolute idealism. As a theological student in Tubigen, he had shown little interest in theology but a great enthusiasm for Greek culture. His theological certificate mentioned that he was deficient in philosophy—as Pasteur was in chemistry! In his early years, he wrote a rationalistic life of Jesus as the son of Joseph and Mary, in which he ignored the miraculous. He sought, however, to find the secret in his life and teaching that made him the hope of the human race.

In 1818, Hegel at last took the chair of philosophy in the University of Berlin where he gained influence by his increasing solidarity with the Prussian Government. He had slowly developed his vast, all-embracing system of thought. It would be as impossible as it would be unnecessary to quote at length from the twenty-two volumes that record his life and teaching. His system is animated by the idea that whatever is real is rational and whatever is rational is real. Hegel finds logic in nature and history, for in his view nature and mind are one. Everywhere he has the Prussian overpowering sense of the value of organization. He holds that fundamental principles of law, morality, and social institutions, of art, religion, and philosophy are connecting stages in the logical evolution of the rational will. In his logic the dialectical movement of progress through conflict runs through everything Hegel wrote. This dialectical movement is observable in things and in thought, in the human mind and in all history. The whole universe is a process of development.

The Absolute, which is the sum total of all things in their development, is reason itself, it is Mind, it is the metaphysical definition of God. The Absolute is the life process, it is evolution as well as consciousness and knowledge. It moves toward self-consciousness, but movement in nature and history is unconscious. The whole universe is in process of evolution in which the purpose of universal reason is finally realized. The truth lies not in the unfinished process but in the end result, in the whole, in all things in their relationship. God to Hegel is the Idea, the potential universe not yet evolved, the totality of all the possibilities of evolution. Spirit, or Mind, is the Idea realized. The Idea is the creative logos. God cannot be without creating the world; and the world is not real without God; it owes its truth to God. The Idea is enriched in self-expression in nature and history, and rises through them to self-consciousness. The Absolute becomes conscious only in evolution, especially in man. Hegel's God resembles the final plan of a house when it is completed rather than the conscious and intelligent architect who plans and builds the house. The whole universe is a living organism.

In Hegel's philosophy of history—which is the thoughtful consideration of the meaning of world events—the perfect state realizes perfect freedom which is the goal and purpose of universal history. Hegel even calls the state "the actual God." In the restoration of Prussia under Stein he thought the culmination of the world's history was attained! Mind objectifies itself in the state and completes the circle of Absolute Mind in art, religion, and philosophy, which is the science of the absolute. Philosophy can know nature, the entire world of experience, and God. There is no limit to the thinking faculty in its attempt to bring all reality under a single formula. As reason is the sovereignty of the world, the history of the world presents us with a rational process. Reason is the substance of the universe; it is the infinite energy of life; it is the infinite complexity of things, their entire essence and truth. Providence presides over the events of the world.

As the essence of matter is gravity, the essence of Spirit is freedom. Freedom is realized in three stages. In the Oriental stage, only *one* is free; but in his caprice and cruelty the despot himself is not a free man. In the Greco-Roman civilization, *some* are free—not man as such. For Hegel the German nations, under the influence of Christianity, were the first to attain the consciousness that man, as man, is free. This consciousness of freedom arose first in religion, but religion like everything else is a progressive development: e.g., slavery did not end immediately on the reception of Christianity.[3]

There are two elements like the warp and woof in the vast web of universal history: The first is the Idea, the second the complex of human passions. The history of the world is not the theater of happiness, but the sorrow of the world spiritualizes it. History itself is "the Golgotha of the Absolute Spirit." Man was made for and is saved by suffering. Struggle is the law of growth; character is built in the storm and stress of the world. Great historical men are those whose particular aims are carrying out, consciously or unconsciously, the will of the World-Spirit. The good, the reason in the world in its most concrete form is God who governs the world. The working of his government, the carrying out of his plan is the true history of the world.

The history of the world travels from East to West. Asia is the beginning and Europe is absolutely the end of history. The little continents that Columbus had discovered would never be significant! Might makes right in the conquest of one nation by another. The idea for which the conquered nation stands is subordinated to the victorious nation. Physical power and rational justice coincide by a kind of preestablished harmony. The progress of humanity is furthered by moral and physical conflict, by war and revolution. Yet "the history of the world is nothing but the development of the idea of freedom!"

---

[3] *The Philosophy of History,* Colonial Press ed., p. 18.

Hegel gives a very deistic account of an assumed spectator of the world's history, which he calls in turn reason, or God, or Providence. His doctrine of the Trinity is transparently pantheistic: "The abstract God, the Father, is the universal." This universal does not arrive at consciousness until man appears. Unfortunately Hegel could not start on the solid rock of Genesis: "In the beginning God."[4] We have already spoken of the oversimplification and pantheistic tendency revealed in Hegel's closing paragraph of his *Philosophy of History*.

> The history of the world . . . is this process of development and the realization of Spirit—this is the justification of God in history . . . What has happened, and is happening every day, is not only not without God, but is essentially His work.

It would seem unkind to ask if the last decade of Germany under Hitler with its enslavement and starvation of Europe, its mass murder of Jews, its torture and death chambers, were "essentially God's work." However imposing, Hegel's subjective philosophy of history is utterly unhistorical. We see how much of his often profound thought was wishful thinking. When we come to Marx, we shall see how much of our own thinking is equally so. In these various philosophies of history, we see history interpreted in turn from the point of view of the mythical, the theological, the philosophic, the naturalistic, and the economic. Each contains a partial truth but each is relative and incomplete. We hope to learn something from each as a contribution to our final synthesis.

4. Marx in the Modern World

In answer to our question, Is God in History?, Marx would have answered, No. He would hold that nature and history are neutral stuff which man must fashion to his own ends.

---

[4] Hegel says: "God is God only in so far as he knows himself," but he only arrives at self-consciousness in man. "The first was the Idea in its simple universality for itself. . . . The second was the Idea in its externality. . . . The third is this consciousness, God as Spirit, and this Spirit as existing in the community." *Philosophie der Religion*, 1832, II, p. 261.

Man must depend upon himself. The power behind the universe is neither friendly nor unfriendly—it is vain to ask. Man must create his own evolution and "plan" the universe to suit himself. He must make history and give it meaning. Any secularist can believe in justice and an atheist may believe in brotherhood.

It will be recalled that we were to consider throughout this volume four major strands in history: the moral and spiritual, the intellectual and esthetic, the political, and the economic. More than any other man, it was Karl Marx who opened the eyes of the modern world to see the basic importance of the economic factor as a determinant not only of the social forces, but of the ideas and the institutions of an age. Wholly apart from the measure of truth or error in his economic theories, the dominant place of Russia in the modern world is at least one indication of the central importance of Marx himself. If we would understand history in the twentieth century, we must understand Russia—and to understand Russia, we must grasp the system of Marx.

We may find that the part played by Marx in the making of the modern world—whether for good or ill—is as epoch-making as the work of Copernicus or of Darwin was in the world of thought. Each of these was the leader of a movement which became a great historic watershed. Probably Darwin and Marx have influenced the thought and action of multitudes in our own day more radically than any other writers of the nineteenth century. Though the suggestion may seem to some almost blasphemous, more millions of men in the world today are following two members of the Jewish race than are following any other men who ever lived—Jesus of Nazareth and Karl Marx.

To realize the background of history which Marx sought to interpret, we may suggest in the most simplified form—and confessedly somewhat oversimplified—that *Western man passes through four principal economic stages in history: slavery, feudalism, capitalism, and some form of a socialized* *planned economy*. Slavery, feudalism, and capitalism represent three distinct modes of production, and though all have existed side by side, as in ancient Greece, one or the other was dominant in a given society. Under slavery—whether in Sumeria, Egypt, Greece, Rome, or among the nations and colonies of Western civilization—a few owned the workers who were the principal means of production under a slave economy.

Under feudalism, a few owned the land, the principal means of production of that period, while the many were serfs, half slave and half free, often bought and sold with the land. Under the third stage of capitalism, relatively few own or, what is more important, control the more complex means of production of this era. This ownership includes the machines of industry, the raw materials and resources of the earth, banks and credit, the so-called "public" utilities and processes by which society is fed, clothed, and housed, and upon which the material life of the people depend—in fact, the means of living for the bulk of the population—whether employed or unemployed—who are often helplessly dependent upon these owners.[5]

In the fourth stage, we have some form of a socialized planned economy. It may be complete socialism as in Soviet Russia, or it may be a transitional approach to such by the gradual introduction of various features of a planned economy such as T.V.A. projects, or the nationalization of certain essential banks, industries and utilities as proposed by the Labor Party of Great Britain. After World Wars I and II the trend in nearly all countries is unmistakably away from unregulated laissez-faire capitalism, which Americans love to call "free enterprise," or "the American plan," toward some form of a socialized planned economy.

---

[5] By capitalism we mean in this volume the private ownership of the social means of production, not primarily for use but for the profit and power of the owners, while the workers are formally or legally free to sell their labor-power. Private ownership extends to nearly all the means of life, whether under the system of competitive capitalism with its individual initiative and free enterprise, or monopolistic capitalism, both of which resent any government control. The Soviet system involves the state ownership and control of all means of production, distribution, and exchange, under a dictatorship exercised on behalf of the working class. The present system in Russia is called socialism which Stalin says means: "From each according to his ability, to each according to the quantity and quality of his labor." Russia looks forward to pure communism which Stalin says means: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

The life of Karl Marx (1818-1883) is too well known to require more than a brief reminder of one or two facts that throw light on his system. Marx was born in a long line of Jewish rabbis and laymen. In his philosophical struggles, he turned his back on the absolute idealism of Kant and Fichte, but was taken captive by his great master, Hegel, and his dialectical method of progress through conflict. His association with Feuerbach and other left-wing young Hegelians turned him from all religion to materialistic realism or naturalism. His own use of the term, materialism, however, was interchangeable with the term, science. Forced by the attitude of the authorities to his radicalism to leave Germany, France, and Belgium in turn, he finally settled in tolerant London for thirty-four years. In 1848 he and his friend, Engels—the son of a rich German manufacturer who owned a cotton mill near Manchester—issued the *Communist Manifesto* which furnished a philosophy and a program of action for the movement of the radical workers, as Rousseau's *Social Contract* had to the American and French Revolutions.

His system of fighting socialism was supposed to be adapted to the most advanced industrial countries like Germany. Instead, it was adopted by a small company of intellectuals around Lenin in industrially backward Russia; and in the revolution of 1917, supported by throngs of workers, soldiers, and peasants, they seized the tottering czarist state and established the Marxian "dictatorship of the proletariat." In a way quite unforeseen and unprecedented, Marxism came to furnish a unified philosophy of life for almost the whole people of Russia. While Plato's *Republic,* More's *Utopia,* and Bacon's *Atlantis* were idealistic pipe-dreams of a few theorists, here for the first time in history, a logical, philosophical system was more swiftly and completely embodied in the life of a whole people than any other ever known in human annals. Marx had gathered up all the vague revolt and hopes of the oppressed toilers and given them what *appeared* to be a clear philosophy, a program of action, and such a relationship to the cosmic forces that it seemed that they were advancing to certain victory. In a way that is highly flattering and appealing to the workers, Marxism appears to unite the ultimates of philosophy with practical economics, applied science, dynamic sociology, and social psychology, coupled with an almost religious emotion and future prophecy in an apocalyptic interpretation of history. It has all the appearance, not of faith, but of scientific certainty. Marxists believe in a rational principle in the universe, and an ethical progress in history that promises to transform both the material environment and human nature.[6]

THE PHILOSOPHY OF KARL MARX

Marx's teaching resolves itself into three principal elements: a philosophy of history, an economic theory, and a practical program for the realization of a new social order. We may sum up these three principal positions as follows:

a. His philosophic method, *the dialectic process,* maintains that evolution in nature, history, and the human mind is through the conflict and resolving of opposing forces. His philosophy of history, in its *materialist* or *economic interpretation,* holds that the principal influence which shapes human progress is the method of economic production in each period.

b. His labor theories of *value* and *surplus-value* endeavor to show that the workers who create value receive less than they produce, under a system where the owners of the means of production unjustifiably appropriate the surplus.

c. His theory of social development by revolution is that the *conflict of classes* is the driving force of history, which leads, through the inner contradiction of an economic system, to its ripening and decline, to the end of one epoch and the birth of the next.

---

[6] "By acting on the external world and changing it, man changes his own nature" (*Capital,* I, 198) for "all history is the progressive modification of human nature."

His practical program is through the organization of labor unions, the waging of the class war, and setting up at the appropriate time, upon the breakdown of the old order, under *the dictatorship of the proletariat,* the new socialist state, which is ultimately to bring in the final, classless society of communism.[7] Marx accepts Hegel's dialectic formula and method but in place of the abstract and mystical Idea, he substitutes economic forces as the dynamic of change. In place of Hegel's idealism, he substitutes his own materialism. He places the material world as the basic reality and man's ideas as "the material world reflected by the human mind and translated into terms of thought."

Marx held that Hegel had turned the realistic system of Aristotle "wrong side down," while he was now turning Hegel "right side up again." For Hegel, "history is the autobiography of God," the march of the Spirit toward freedom. For Marx, history is simply man's pursuit of human ends. Hegel tried to understand history and the action of God in it; Marx tried to change it. For Hegel the State represents "the march of God on earth"; for Marx the State is the tool of the owners of the means of production. For Marx or John Dewey, true philosophy is only the instrument for creating the good life for all.[8]

---

[7] I am indebted throughout this chapter not only to the writings of Marx, which I shall quote, but to the interpretive works of Dr. A. D. Lindsay, the Master of Balliol, in his *Karl Marx's Capital;* Professor Sidney Hook's *Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx,* and *From Hegel to Marx;* the writings of Max Beer; Professor Harold Laski's *Communism* and his essay on *Karl Marx;* and the Ryazanoff edition of the *Communist Manifesto.*

[8] Marx was a fighter, and such a man can best be understood by the things he fights against. For four and a half decades, he fought against an unjust economic order and its defenders of privilege, against the philosophical idealists who were not realistic, against mechanistic materialists and fatalists who did not leave room for man's freedom under mechanistic determinism, against romantic and utopian socialists and religionists who would not effectively organize to bring in a new epoch, and against selfish individualists and atomists who did not see the necessity of a class movement.

To Marx, capitalism was a mighty achievement and was itself the result of class struggle. In the same way, the now outcast proletariat, or fourth estate, is driven to struggle for its rights as each of the now privileged classes had in turn done before it. Marx gave the masses a fighting faith. They did not need to understand it. Claiming to be grounded in science and natural law, the very stars in their courses seemed to be fighting for justice and the classless society of ultimate brotherhood. It was the belief of Marx, as it is of all communists today, that the costs of a short, violent revolution are far less than the appalling death rate from capitalism's chronic slums, poverty, periodic unemployment, malnutrition, and ever-recurring wars. Therefore they believe that their ultimate purpose is not to destroy, but to save lives that our unjust order is already wantonly destroying. It is interesting to note that Marx thought in 1872 that the United States and England might prove exceptions and that the workers in these countries might win justice without the necessity of a violent revolution. In his speech to the workingmen at Amsterdam, he said: "There are certain countries, such as the United States and England, in which the workers may hope to secure their ends by peaceful means."[9]

The state, which was originally organized as an instrument of class dominance, is supposed in time to disappear under a classless society. After a temporary dictatorship, whose sole object was ruthlessly to build a socialist society as quickly as possible, the workers would then achieve their ideal of "production according to one's capacities, and distribution according to one's needs." Rigid state socialism is expected to end in communism. People will have learned right habits and the government will be a mere organ for the administration of production. The political state will then "wither away."[10]

---

[9] Speech at Amsterdam, 1872, in the *History of the First International,* quoted by Sidney Hook, *Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx,* p. 291.

When we seek to evaluate Marx, we must recognize the initial prejudice with which most of us approach the system. Many of us belong, or hope to belong, to the economically privileged, or to the comfortable middle class dependent upon them. We know little and therefore care inadequately how the other half of humanity lives—the poor, periodically unemployed organized labor, and the economically disinherited. We do not realize how largely our whole view of life is economically determined by our social environment and the views of our own class.

Before acknowledging my debt to Marx, I must state clearly the points where I am in radical disagreement and would part company with him:

1. I do not believe that violent revolution is inevitable, nor do I believe that it is desirable in itself as Marx almost makes it. When once violence is adopted as a method in an inevitable and "continuing revolution," when to Marx's philosophy is added Lenin's monstrous false dictum that "great problems in the lives of nations are solved *only by force,"* most serious consequences follow wherever communism is installed under a dictatorship. This shuts the gates of mercy on mankind.

2. As a natural outgrowth of the doctrine of the inevitability of a violent transition are the prevailing methods adopted by the Communist Party to foment strife and hasten the revolution by every possible means where it has not yet occurred. Violence, slander, hatred, falsehood, misrepresentation, must be freely used and are used. There is often an element of fanatical absolutism about Marxists which makes it almost impossible for democratic liberals to co-operate

---

[10] Marx says: "Then there will no longer be any political power, in the strict sense of the term, seeing that political power is the official expression of the conflicts within bourgeois society." Engels says: "In one domain after another, the intervention of a state authority in social relations becomes superfluous, and therefore spontaneously ceases to occur. The government of persons is replaced by the administration of things and by the management of the processes of production. The state is not abolished, it withers away." Marx, *Misère de la Philosophie,* p. 243. Engels, *Anti-Duhring,* p. 103.

with them. They seem to believe that they are always absolutely right and all others are wrong. Thus typically, Lenin wrote:

> The genius of Marx lies exactly in the fact that he provided the answers to questions which the leading thinkers of mankind had already posed. His teaching arose as the direct and unbroken continuation of the teachings of the greatest representatives of philosophy, political economy and socialism. . . . The teaching of Marx is all powerful because it is true. It is complete and systematic, giving to people an integrated world view incompatible with superstition, with reaction, or with the defence of bourgeois oppression. It is the lawful successor of the best that mankind created in the nineteenth century in German philosophy, English political economy, and French Socialism. . . . Materialism turned out to be the only consistent philosophy true to all the teachings of natural science, inimical to superstition, magic, etc.[11]

Lenin castigates all trade unions which do not admit Communists as members, yet he himself advised Communists to join trade unions to capture and control and at the opportune moment to wreck them. Most of us feel under obligation to a moral law to be honest, but for the Communist, anything is right that aids the revolution. Most of us are bound in loyalty to God and to our country, but the Communist is bound to be loyal to his party line and to Russia, however often that line is changed or contradicted by orders from Moscow.

3. I cannot agree with Marx that the proletariat is the one and only messianic class, just as the Jews are not the only chosen people. Marx, instead of a chosen people, conceives of a chosen class—the suffering proletariat. The middle class also has revealed possibilities which Marx did not foresee. And he was wrong in assuming that the evolution of capitalism would impoverish and proletarianize most of the population. The doctrine of a messianic class has caused and

---

[11] Lenin, *Three Sources and Three Essential Elements of Marxism*, 1913, quoted by Paul Anderson, *People, Church and State in Modern Russia*, 1944, p. 45.

tried to justify great cruelty in Russia where it has demanded three awful purges, yet it has not produced, nor is it in the way of producing, the classless or well-nigh perfect social order which was vainly expected upon the false premise of its messianic character. Such prophecy is not realism but primitivism.

4. Finally, I disagree fundamentally with Marx as to the nature of reality. It may be conceived as mechanical, as organic, or as superorganic. Mechanically conceived, the universe may be considered as a heartless machine, and man an automaton of fate. Or, second, reality may be conceived, with Hegel and Marx, as an organic process. Marx, in his dialectical materialism, takes up the mechanical relationships into his wider organic interpretation. But there is a third form of relationship that is superorganic, of which friendship would be a type. Personal reality is superorganic.

I feel concerning Marx as Wordsworth did concerning the abstract materialism of the early nineteenth century, that *something had been left out*. Humanists, religionists, liberals, and even radicals of various schools of thought will not be appealed to by the drab monotony of the materialistic mass life of the economic man in Russia. After long struggle, when material abundance has been gained, they will probably become ultimately aware of the fact that man cannot live by bread alone.

Karl Marx could not see God in history for there was no place in his system for God. All unconscious of his own wishful thinking, he was able to devise a system that contained all his desires and to believe in a universe that was co-operating with him. He imagined that he had discovered by strictly scientific processes the laws which made the ultimate victory of the proletariat practically demonstrable. Quite illogically, and with unconscious theological bias, he believed that the stars in their courses were fighting for justice and the ultimate revolution for a classless society. This is quite reasonable if God is in history but quite illogical if there is no intelligent purpose behind the material universe.

There was in Marx's system a residue of quasi-religious faith which he did not recognize—the faith of his ancestral Jewish prophets in ethical monotheism. His socially prophetic vision was a secularized version of the oft-repeated apocalyptic version of a redeemed society for the disinherited classes. Marx had, all unconsciously, read his own revolutionary purpose into the structure of the universe. He assumed, without the necessity of proof, that the world is evolving of its own necessary motion, by a dialectic procedure "from the lower to the higher," to install a reign of justice "with iron necessity." This, of course, is not science, nor is it capable of scientific demonstration. It is religious faith and the Christian may believe it, but on the basis of Marx's materialistic hypothesis it is religious superstition. To understand the meaning of Marx will help us to understand the meaning of history, to realize how God is working in history today, especially in the economic sphere which affects all others.

5. Spengler's Decline of the West

If men do not believe in a creative God who is active in history, they can take history as Spengler did and mold it into any pattern they choose. Their philosophy of history becomes a sort of a game philosophers play, each kneading the seemingly formless dough of history into a cake to his own taste. Any philosopher is free to spin his own theory; all he needs is a publisher to broadcast his book. And Spengler's work was most timely as the ideal apologetic of German militarism and a justification of the methods of the coming gangsters of Hitler's National Socialism. If there be no creative God in history, there may be as many histories as there are philosophers. We can see in Spengler, however, where the Axis powers took the wrong turn and what became of a devastated Europe and a wartorn world when men shut God out of life and human history.

Plato's beautiful dream of *The Republic* inspired a score of Utopias; Marx's realistic philosophy of blood and iron was incarnated in Soviet Russia; while Spengler's theories have been embodied in the Prussian militarism of World Wars I and II—which are only two of a series of wars that Spengler predicts. Spengler was born in 1880. When he was thirty-four, as a brilliant young philosopher he conceived his *Decline of the West* before 1914, viewing our failing civilization as the coming conflict would find it, and seeing no hope save in "Caesarism" and world war. The fatalism and pessimism of the book so appealed to defeated post-war Germany that ninety thousand copies were quickly sold. If fate was responsible for Germany's defeat and if no one won the war, here was another alibi for Germany's inferiority complex.

Spengler sees a "sense of destiny" as the motivating spirit of the West. World history repeats itself in eras and epochs. Each culture has its own new possibilities of self-expression that arise, ripen, decay, and never return. Spengler sees world history as a picture of endless formations and transformations. He proposes to "think in continents," to be the creative Copernicus of a new philosophy of history, boldly to attempt for the first time "to predetermine history." He speaks of the destiny of the Western-European—American civilization and its decay, and thinks we are now entering upon a world-historical phase of wars that will cover several centuries. At the close of his first volume, Spengler charts history in very elaborate tables under the symbolism of the four seasons of Spring, Summer, Autumn, and Winter. In the Spring of history, we have the birth of mythology and of religion; in the Summer we have periods of reformation; in the Autumn the age of rationalism and enlightenment; and in Winter, the age of a materialistic world outlook, the period of science, utility, prosperity—and war. Based upon clever analogies, Spengler assumes without any proof whatever that society is an organism, exactly like an individual. America, instead of being merely the aggregate of some hundred and forty million individuals, is a living organism, and Uncle Sam is destined or fated, like each individual citizen, to birth, youth, maturity, senility, and death.

In his *Decline of the West,* Spengler says in brief:

> Every civilization passes through the same succession of ages as an individual human being. The nearer a civilization approaches its zenith, the greater will be its manliness, severity, discipline, self-fulfillment, and self-expression. Later, in the time of old age, before the soul's fire goes out, its ebbing strength ventures once again to attempt an act of creation. Finally cold and listless, it sinks back into the darkness of primitive mysticism, into the womb, into the grave. Every civilization, every archaic age, every rise and every downfall, and every inevitable phase of each of these movements is a definite time span, which is always the same, and which always recurs with symbolic emphasis.[12]

While Spengler's thesis superficially seems to be true of certain past civilizations, without offering any proof, on the basis of a mere handful of facts, he dogmatically asserts a universal and inexorable law. By skilful jugglery, by the omission or cutting off of all awkward contradictory facts, Spengler makes all history fit his Procrustean bed of fatalism. By an artifice of literary expression, by a simile, an analogy, he proclaims a dogma, a universal cosmic law that determines the destiny of nations. The hopeless and bewildered Germans could not see through Spengler nor recognize him as a false prophet, as Nietzsche had been in some aspects of his teaching with his dangerous half-truths. For societies are not living organisms. The all-powerful Leviathan state is a mere myth. We can trace very clearly how nations deteriorate and perish through the failure of statesmanship, through bitter internal divisions, or through the dry rot of materialistic luxury and sensuous immorality. Or they may be reborn, as was England in the time of Magna Carta, of Cromwell, of William of Orange; or as in the American, French, or Russian revolutions. Each nation, under God, is the master of its fate. If it defies and breaks the moral law, it will perish and other nations will have their opportunity.

---

[12] Oswald Spengler's *Der Untergang des Abendlandes,* Munich Edition of 1920, pp. 154, 157, 158. Owing to Spengler's diffuse style, the above quotations are not continuous.

Spengler in his fatalism is left without God and without hope. He says: "Atheism is the necessary expression of a spirituality that has accomplished itself and declined into the inorganic." He counts Nietzsche a "dynamic" atheist when he says, "God is dead." Nietzsche believed in the miracle of a new savior race, a creative aristocracy which could arise out of a wholly exhausted life-force. Spengler did not believe in the spiritual; he applied the biological point of view to the rise and decay of cultures, and rationally calculated their decline and death. Spengler's heroes are always Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon, Frederick the Great, Bismarck, and Moltke. He thus pours contempt on all pacifism and all vain dreams of peace:

> War is the creator of all great things. Peace means degeneration and degradation. Might is right. The idea of justice pervades all religions and philosophies, all whose spirit is noble but whose blood is weak. The fact-world knows only the success which turns the law of the stronger (in Prussia) into the law of all. Over ideals might marches without pity. A revolution annihilates laws. Peace treaties are never true. Life knows no moral logic; it makes law for others. The end of all democracies, all parliamentarism, is Caesarism. The mighty ones of the future may possess the earth as their private property (in World War I, II or III).
>
> There now sets in the final battle between Democracy and Caesarism. The last conflict is between money and blood. The sword is victorious over money. Always world history has sacrificed truth and justice to might and race, and passed doom and death upon men and peoples. For us whom Destiny has placed in this Culture and at this moment of its development—the moment when money is celebrating its last victories, and the Caesarism that is to succeed, approaches with quiet firm step—our direction, willed and obligatory at once, is set for us within narrow limits and on any other terms life is not worth the living.[13]

We cannot excuse Spengler because of his youth or inexperience, for he learned nothing from World War I, in which he holds that Germany was guiltless, encircled by jealous powers that attacked her. His is both the Bourbon and the Prussian military mind that never learns and never forgets anything. In his last book, *The Hour of Decision*, published in Munich in 1933, just as Hitler, already Chancellor, was plunging on in his trampling march to power, Spengler was still a false prophet for Germany and the world.[14] Mussolini was "a master-man who was right" in appealing to the Prussian archetype. He had already made good, for the perfection of Caesarism is ruthless dictatorship. But has Germany such a man? Will Hitler or Himmler be ruthless enough? Spengler concludes:

---

[13] Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West,* New York, Alfred Knopf, 1939, Vol. II, pp. 465-507.

> The real evil of our civilization is the over-two centuries of growth of the democratic idea, and its logical consequences of liberalism, socialism, communism, and bolshevism. These are the world's danger. Our civilization faces two great revolutions: the white revolution and the colored revolution. The white revolution is the menacing democratic rise of the masses. The colored world revolution is the rise of the hitherto hopeless downtrodden races—black, brown, yellow, and red—the savages and barbarians hitherto exploited. We thus face class war and race war; one danger is from below, the other from without. Barbarism is the glory of the strong race, the eternal warlike type of the beast of prey. The Germans are the youngest, least exhausted, most warlike and most gloriously barbarous of the white races, so they are the world's white hope. Man is a beast of prey. We live in a mighty warlike age, the greatest day of all Western Civilization. Democracy means formlessness, sordid capitalism. Caesars will now rule. Today as in Bismarck's day, we [Germans] are to take command again of our destiny. The national revolution of 1933 [Hitler's] was a mighty phenomenon. It was Prussian through and through as was the uprising of 1914, which transformed

---

[14] More than two years before this, on October 7, 1930, in the Berlin Weekly, *Die Neul Weltbuehne,* Ernst Toller boldly exposed Hitler and the National Socialist Party. By their control of the Reichswehr, Police, Administration, and Justice, by naked brutal terror applied alike to Socialists, Communists, Pacifists, and the few surviving Democrats, he holds that the National Socialists will place Germany and Europe under a fascism which means the destruction of social, political, and spiritual liberty, and from which redemption can be expected only after horrible, bloody confusion and wars. But Spengler is completely blind to all this, for Hitler is the embodiment of his Caesarism.

> souls in one moment. I see further than others. We stand, it may be, just before a second world war and Germany is the key country of the world.[15]
>
> The National Socialists believe that they can afford to ignore the world or oppose it. All great fact-men have contempt for mankind. No nation can stand a long peace without deterioration of soul. The peace between 1870 and 1914 was all too long. The League of Nations was but a swarm of parasitic holiday makers. Senile people take refuge in religion. The Caesars will now take the place of the world improvers. We have now entered the stage of World Wars which will probably outlast the twentieth and the twenty-first centuries. The Fascist formation of this decade will pass into new, unforeseeable forms [under the Nazis]. There remains as a formative power only the warlike, Prussian spirit. Caesar's legions are returning to consciousness. Here, possibly even in our own century, the ultimate decisions are waiting for their man [Hitler]. He whose sword compels victory here will be lord of the world. The dice are there ready for this stupendous game. *Who dares to throw them?*[16]

This was just the philosophy of history that Nazi gangsters craved and could utilize. It was followed for a decade by the greatest military nation of the modern world. It provided a demonstration of the kind of a world man can make when he renounces God and tries to make a world in his own image. This false philosophy denied justice, it scorned brotherhood, it crushed all liberty, it turned love into hate.

6. Arnold Toynbee's Study of History

Invaluable source material for answering the question, Is God in History? is found in the six volumes of Arnold Toynbee's *A Study of History*.[17] His work well illustrates Lord

---

[15] Oswald Spengler, *The Hour of Decision,* New York, Alfred A. Knopf, p. xvi. Written in Munich, July 1933, while Hitler was Chancellor.

[16] *The Hour of Decision,* p. 230. Knopf (Alfred A.) N. Y. C.

[17] Arnold Joseph Toynbee as a brilliant student, fellow, and tutor of Balliol College, Oxford, was thoroughly prepared in the field of Greek history and of classical and European languages to make this imposing Study. He was Research Professor of International History in the University of London; since 1925, he has been Director of Studies in the Royal Institute of International Affairs, and since 1943, Director of the Research Department of the British Foreign Office. He has been aided by a corps of able specialists working under his direction in the production of this composite but unified and brilliant work. Arnold Toynbee, *A Study of History,* Oxford University Press, 1930.

Acton's saying: "By universal history I understand that which is distinct from the combined history of all countries, and is not a burden on the memory but an illumination of the soul." Toynbee's wide vista of history is indeed an illumination of the soul, and in his study of the rise and fall of nations he shows that when a creative minority, which led to the rise of a culture, becomes a dominant minority maintained by force, power invariably corrupts and it marks the sure decline of a civilization.

Toynbee's method is empirical, comparative, and scientific. He does not, however, oversimplify like Hegel, nor, like Spengler, prematurely seek to draw conclusions and formulate laws until they are justified by a wide inductive study of facts. Toynbee finds that "society is not and cannot be anything more than the medium of communication through which the individual human beings interact with one another. It is the individuals and not human societies that 'make' human history" (Vol. III, pp. 230-31). Consequently, the failure of a civilization is not the result of fate or environment but is always in the last analysis a human failure. Toynbee tries to work out a philosophy of history by means of an empirical study of the rise and fall of civilizations. After recognizing the relativity of all historical thinking, he selects twenty-one societies, past and present, of which we have enough knowledge to afford "intelligible fields of historical study."[18] Of these civilizations, sixteen have perished; there are also four other "arrested" and four "abortive" civilizations. In accounting for the origin of civilizations, the usual answers have been race or environment. But Toynbee maintains that growth is not determined by environment, by technical advance, by economics, nor by race, although any or all of these may provide challenges. Toynbee finds that "the so-called racial explanation of differences in human performance and achievement is either an ineptitude or a fraud" (I, 245). John the Baptist's word, "We have Abraham to our father," is a profound criticism and exposure of the fallacy of the racial theory.

---

[18] Toynbee's twenty-one societies are: (1) Egyptian; (2) Andean; (3) Sinic (China); (4) Minoan; (5) Sumeric; (6) Mayan; (7) Yucatec; (8) Mexic; (9) Hittite; (10) Syriac; (11) Babylonic; (12) Iranic and (13) Arabic, fused to produce Islam; (14) Far Eastern, Main Body; (15) Far Eastern, Japanese Offshoot; (16) Indic; (17) Hindu; (18) Hellenic; (19) Orthodox Christian, Main Body; (20) Orthodox Christian, Russian Offshoot; (21) Western (European and American). The five arrested civilizations, the Polynesians, the Esquimaux, the Nomads, the Spartans, and last the Osmanli Turks, were all immobilized in consequence of having attempted and achieved a *tour de force.*

The basic pattern by which Toynbee accounts for the rise and fall of civilizations is that of "Challenge and Response." All civilizations have come into being as responses on the part of individual human beings to the challenge offered to them by the physical environment, or by the human social environment, or by a combination of the two. The genesis of all civilizations is transformation from a static condition of barbarism, where custom is adamant, to a dynamic activity as the result of the challenge offered to society. A dynamic society where progress is possible must "welcome each rebuff that turns earth's smoothness rough." And it must keep growing by ever responding to new stimuli. Our life is so ordered that nature and history furnish the stimuli; it is ours to respond.

Toynbee finds "the criterion of growth is progress toward self-determination" (III, 183, 216). The determining factor in the birth and growth of civilizations is found in creative individuals and in a creative minority who find the successful responses to the challenges confronting their society. The rest, the great majority of society, are not creative but merely follow the creative minority. The process whereby the creative minority leads is one of social drill or imitation. Toynbee does not agree with Carlyle's "great man" theory of history, but he shows the importance of individual leadership and responsibility. The great work of the world has always been done by minorities—even in Russia which exalts the proletariat.

The geniuses who have performed the miracles of creation and have thereby brought about the beginnings of religions, the beginnings of civilizations and their growths, are more than mere men. (III, 232). The new specific character, the possession of which enables them to break the vicious circle of primitive human social life and to resume the work of creation, may be called "personality," whereby "individual human beings are able to perform those creative acts, in their outward fields of action, that cause the growth of human societies" (III, 233). There is always danger, however, as Lord Acton pointed out, that the leaders and the minority may not remain creative; they tend to become proud and arrogant and to idolize their past successes. This is the turning point between growth and breakdown in a civilization:

> The successive transformations of the prophet into the drill sergeant and of this martinet into a terrorist explain the declines and falls of civilizations in terms of leadership. (IV, 132).

This transformation of the creative minority into a dominant minority creates schisms, both horizontal and vertical, in the body social. The verticle schisms appear as geographic splits ending in internecine warfare. In the horizontal schisms of a class society, the masses secede from the dominant minority and become a proletariat.[19]

The period of internal warfare, which occurs in each of the twenty-one typical societies, Toynbee calls the "Time of Troubles." These appear throughout history from Sumeria, Egypt, Greece, and Rome to the American Civil War and the present period of world wars. In Toynbee's perspective, the Time of Troubles of our Western civilization began with the wars of religion in the sixteenth century, and after a lull recommenced with the wars of nationalism which have now widened into world wars. Western society has started on its period of breakdown, but no civilization is doomed until it actually falls; thus Western civilization is in a critical but not yet hopeless condition. Economically, Western society has conquered the globe and tried to make one world, but politically it is rent by the internecine warfare of rival states, each maintaining absolute and independent sovereignty. Absolute national sovereignty means international anarchy in a period of recurring world wars.

---

[19] Marx despaired of popular democracy and limited the dominant minority to the dictatorship of the whole proletariat. Lenin had to further restrict the dictatorship to the more select and politically literate Communist Party. Trotsky wanted to abandon party dictatorship and confine the leadership of the Party to the Center. Stalin, in the face of the Trotsky revolt, has tended temporarily to narrow the directive still further to the Polit Bureau. Under Fascism or National Socialism there is but one *Führer,* in totalitarian tyranny. This whole tendency shows the danger of the dominant minority governing by force. And these dictatorships never, within measurable history, "wither away," but have continually to tighten their hold by a terror. Russia has already passed through three awful purges.

In his last two volumes, Toynbee maintains that in a period of disintegration there are four ways in which men react to schism in the social body and to the deeper schism in the soul of man: Anarchism, Futurism, Detachment, and Transfiguration. The first three are futile for they are all "acts of truancy" which try to escape from the realities of the present.[20]

Of Transfiguration, Toynbee says in brief:

> A soul constrained to live in a disintegrating civilization or in a crisis like the present confronts a spiritual problem. It sees no hope save in what we have called Transfiguration. The kingdom of this world is possessed and informed by the Kingdom of God, as matter is shot through by radiation. The presence of the Kingdom of God is manifested in the operation of the Spirit that transfigures and redeems the world. The Church is the body of

---

[20] Anarchism is an attempt at a forcible stoppage of change in a disintegrating society, to peg it at its present level. Futurism is an attempt at a forcible accomplishment of change. Both are contrary to the laws of growth and to the order of Nature and are foredoomed to failure. Opposed to these two violent responses are the "gentle responses" of Detachment and Transfiguration which substitute a genuine spiritual change for a mere nominal one. Both are "otherworldly" and do not contemplate a future state of mundane existence. Detachment is "a way that leads out of this world; its goal is an asylum; and the fact that that asylum excludes this world is the feature that makes it attractive . . . This unknowable and neutral *Nirvana,* or 'City of Zeus' (of Marcus Aurelius), which is the goal of the philosophic movement of Detachment, is the very antithesis of the Kingdom of Heaven, or *Civitas Dei,* which is entered by way of the religious experience of Transfiguration . . . The divine 'Other World' transcends the earthly life of man without ceasing to embrace it . . . 'the Kingdom of God is within you'" (V, 394-396).

Christ, eternal, yet in the world. This world can be seen as a manifestation of God's all-pervading presence and activity. In the person of Christ—very God yet also very Man—the divine society and the mundane society have a common member, who is born into the ranks of the Proletariat and dies the death of a malefactor—a King who is God himself and not God's less-than-divine deputy. The stone which the Stoic Zeno and Gautama have rejected has become the head of the corner of the temple of the New Testament. Love is the motive both of the Incarnation and of the Crucifixion. Love is the life-blood of this supramundane body, human and divine, on earth and in heaven. The solution of our problem is found in enrolling ourselves as citizens of the City of God, of which Christ crucified is king. God himself is in action always and everywhere in the world.

In his first four volumes, Toynbee had been reverent and objective, but in the closing volumes, he shows for the first time a definitely Christian attitude. No longer the empirical historian, he seems to be anti-rationalist in his philosophy of history. He is in a new element beyond his depth at times. He occasionally uses the somewhat confused language of mysticism, without St. Paul's recognition of our being fellow workers with God, or Augustine's understanding of the Christian's earthly responsibilities. Toynbee finally examines the various types of men who try to save a society in breakdown from the catastrophe toward which it is headed. He identifies four types of "Saviors": "The Savior with the Sword," "The Savior with the Time Machine" (the Archaists and Futurists), "The Philosopher masked as a King" (Detachments), and "The God Incarnate in a Man" (Christ).[21]

To Toynbee, as to St. Augustine, God is the Lord of history. In succeeding volumes, Toynbee has still to give his conclusions concerning the prospects of Western civilization, of universal states, and universal churches. In the meantime Toynbee's six volumes are a definite help toward forming a philosophy of history.

---

[21] If, as Toynbee holds, the only real Savior is God Incarnate in Man, it must be on Jesus' own terms, not on Toynbee's, for here he seems to take a mystical position of escape when he says: "The only claimant to the title (of Savior) who makes good his claims is the savior *from* Society who does not allow himself to be diverted from his aim. The would-be savior *from* Society who lapses into the role of a would-be savior *of* Society is condemning himself to the failure that is in store for his comrade who cast himself for this role deliberately. It is only in so far as he succeeds in finding, and showing, the way into an Other World, out of the range of the City of Destruction, that the would-be savior is able to accomplish his mission." (VI, 279).

7. Other Philosophies of History

It would take a volume much larger than this to record, even in brief form, the philosophies of history worked out by leading thinkers in the ancient and modern world. In the Christian era, during the first decades after the crucifixion, only eschatological events like the destruction of Jerusalem were considered worth noting, and none were worth recording if history was so soon to be terminated, The Book of the Acts was the first history of the providential spread of the Christian movement up to the time of Paul's arrival in Rome. Under Constantine, the first Christian Roman Emperor (307-337 A.D.), Christians naturally took a new interest in secular history and Christian bishops finally sought to dictate policies to Roman magistrates and princes.[22]

Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine (314-340), as "the father of ecclesiastical history," became the spokesman of the new historical outlook and tried to reconstruct a new chronology of ancient history. He sought to show that in history, under divine providence, God was working his will through the Christian church, as "the narrative of the government of God." Universal history from the beginning was seen as one long preparation for the gospel. Alaric's sack of Rome in 410 was a blow to the belief in God's control of events, but Christians now began to study history in earnest. About 380, Jerome prepared his Latin *Chronicle* and traced the providential development of history from the traditional date of the birth of Abraham in 2016 B.C., to the death of the Emperor Valens in 378. We have already seen the significance of St. Augustine's classic work on the philosophy of history in his *City of God* (412-426), as the perishing Roman state was to be replaced by the Christian church. God was conceived as overruling all history for the education of the human race toward the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth, and the attainment of personal immortality hereafter. Augustine's was the first universal philosophy of history.

---

[22] This tendency reached its climax under Pope Boniface VIII in the year 1302, in his famous Unam Sanctam: "Both the spiritual and temporal swords are in the power of the church, but the latter is wielded for the church and the former by the church; the one by priests, the other by kings and soldiers, but at the command or with the approval of the priest." Quoted by Shirley Jackson Case in *The Christian Philosophy of History,* University of Chicago Press, 1943, p. 51.

The rule of Charlemagne (768-814), as the champion of Christendom, gave a new confidence to Christians. Charlemagne devoutly studied Augustine's *City of God,* but the two "cities" were now merged in one. Church and state were but parts of God's government of the world, and kings as churchmen ruled by divine right. The scholasticism of Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) gave man a larger freedom and responsibility for shaping history, as God and man joined in the government of the world. The system of Thomas was declared by Leo XIII to be the official philosophy of the Roman Catholic Church. Protestants reverted to Augustine's way of thinking, where an omnipotent God overwhelmed human activity, while they eagerly recorded the decline of Roman Catholicism and their hope that a reformed church could overcome the wicked world.

In 1874, Professor Robert Flint reviewed *The Philosophy of History in Europe,* summarizing some of the principal attempts at such a philosophy made in France and Germany up to that time. Most of these French and German writers believe that the reign of law somehow extends over human affairs, that history is not mere anarchy and chaos abandoned to caprice and chance, but that there has been some sign of growth or progress and some development of the mind and spirit of the human race in history. Few, like Schopenhauer, held the novel idea of historical pessimism, confessedly borrowed from Hinduism and Buddhism. Some considered history as the biography of nations, but a greater number, following Polybius, attempted to grasp the meaning of universal history, the conception of which was one of the first results of the universal empire of Rome.

Christianity had introduced the formative idea that the course of history is the unfolding of a divine plan, that kingdoms have risen and fallen in order that a purpose of God regarding man might be realized. Many writers held the idea of progress, like the elder Pliny who exhorts us "firmly to trust that the ages go on incessantly improving." Among the moderns, Descartes (1596-1650), in his *Discourse on Method,* attacked dogmatic authority, traditionalism, and scholasticism, as he sought a general revolution in human thought. While he fostered independence of mind, faith in progress, confidence in the powers of the human reason and in the high destiny of the race, he had such a contempt for antiquity that he had no notion of a science of history and saw no indwelling reason in society determining its movements.

Voltaire (1694-1778), as no other, embodied in himself the Enlightenment, the destructive Age of Reason in France. He came not to fulfill but to destroy the chaotic night of credulity, dogmatism, and absurdity in which the world was shrouded. Despite all his brilliant gifts and his necessary and invaluable work of destruction, he was often obscene, unscrupulous, and even at times dishonest. He saw no plan in human affairs which are as mean and despicable as human nature itself. While he professed to believe in an almighty and righteous God, he practically denied that history presents any evidence of his power or justice. He was hostile to the past as a whole and the bitter enemy of Christianity and the Bible. He says, "History is nothing more than a picture of crimes and misfortunes." "It is nothing but a pack of tricks which we play upon the dead." It is "a Mississippi of falsehoods."

Since the French had made a specialty of skepticism, it was natural that they should produce the founder of the "positivist" movement in Auguste Comte (1798-1857) who carried forward the destructive element in French criticism to its logical conclusion. After surveying all the sciences, Comte, as a historian of ideas, thinks he observes everywhere a Law of Three Stages. At first, each subject was conceived in the *theological* fashion and all problems were explained by the arbitrary will of some deity, as when the stars were gods. Later, the subject reached the *metaphysical* stage, explained by metaphysical abstractions, as when the stars moved in circles as the most perfect figure. Finally, man independently reaches the *scientific* stage as each subject is reduced to positive science by observation, hypothesis, and experiment, explained by cause and effect and governed by immutable laws.

Comte's scientific materialistic theory was the exact opposite of Hegel's philosophy of mind. For Comte, philosophy was put the co-ordination of all the sciences. As all his positivism failed and left men cold, Comte spent his old age developing a "Religion of Humanity" with an elaborate artificial system of worship. "He offered the world all of Catholicism except Christianity." He aimed at a doctrine so complete that it should embrace all knowledge and action. He had mistaken three co-existent stages or ways of looking at things for three successive stages of thought and three epochs of time. The dogmatic, the metaphysical, and at least the germ of positive science have each pervaded all epochs. Positive conceptions began in the beginning of human history and none of the three valuable and necessary methods has ever been discarded. As Dr. Robert Flint remarks:

> Underneath all science there is metaphysics, above all science there is theology; and these three are so related that every advance of science must extend the spheres both of true metaphysics and true theology. Comte has failed entirely to prove that theology and metaphysics are mere passing phases of thought, illusions of the infancy and youth of humanity, which have no sphere of reality corresponding to them. The testimony of history is all the other way; it gives assurance that they have always been, and

grounds of hope that they always will be; that they represent real aspects of existence, and respond to eternal aspirations of the human heart.[23]

Comte believed that science was the end of all possible inquiry, while we have learned that science furnishes only the beginning of our investigation of life, a bare skeleton of existence, a small fraction of the rich fullness of abundant pluralistic experience. Comte vehemently repudiated any theistic implications in morality. In his judgment man should worship himself, since every good and perfect gift cometh, not from above—for there is nothing above man—but from himself. Comte offered one of the ablest and most rational apologetics for a life and history without God.

In striking contrast to the chiefly negative results obtained by the prevailing French skepticism, there stands the monumental work of the great German philosophers and theologians in the philosophy of history. Leibnitz (1646-1716) was rarely gifted as a great historical philosopher. He was the first philosopher profoundly historical in spirit. In place of Descarte's or Spinoza's doctrine of substance, he conceived of individual centers of force, like modern electrons, which he called monads, as the atoms of nature or the elements of things. Because there is an Absolute, a Monad of monads, God, there is a preestablished harmony between the monads and between the whole realm of final causes and that of efficient causes. Faith and reason are essentially harmonious and God, the "universal harmony," is the author of this harmony. Leibnitz says evil is permitted, not willed, by God, because it was foreseen that the world, with evil permitted but finally overcome, would be better than any other *possible*—not theoretical—world of mechanical perfection. Leibnitz was a consistent and thoroughgoing optimist, believing this to be the best of all possible worlds which lay within the possibility of things for God to create. Where reason cannot prove or disprove, Leibnitz falls back upon faith, which has a legitimate function as well as reason.

---

[23] Robert Flint, *Philosophy of History in France and Germany*, 1874, Vol. I, p. 272.

It was in the latter part of the eighteenth century that the idea dawned upon the German mind of there being a philosophy of history. We cannot pause over the work of the brave Lessing (1729-1781). His *Education of the Human Race* is a philosophic consideration of history from the standpoint of religion. For Lessing, man's education is synonymous with God's revelation. He believes that God is educating each individual, each nation, and each age, day by day, and century by century, out of two great textbooks, Nature and Scripture, though none of man's little systems built upon them are final or infallible.

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), in answering Hume who thought he had shown that there was no soul and no science, in his *Critique of Pure Reason*[24] proposes to solve all the problems of metaphysics, and incidentally to save the absoluteness of science and the essential truth of religion. Yet in his humble egotism he had destroyed the naïve world of science as mere surface and appearance, and he had shown forever the humiliating limits of reason in its vain quest for certainty; for all science, art, and religion are but relative in their truths. In the realm of what he calls the "practical reason," however, Kant finds the solid basis of religion in the absolute categorical moral imperative. This absolute command of duty proves at last the freedom of our wills; we feel that we are deathless, and "the postulate of immortality . . . must postulate the existence of God."[25] In 1784 Kant wrote *The Idea of a Universal History,* in which he maintains that human development must proceed according to law and exemplify a plan. Despite our belief in the freedom of the will, human actions are under the control of universal laws and we see a regular stream of tendency in the slow development of man. While individual men and nations seem to be pursuing their own peculiar and contradictory purposes, they are unconsciously following the guidance of a great natural purpose. Prophetically Kant holds that the most important problem of the human race is the establishment of a universal civil society. As savage man was driven to seek the peace and security of civilization, so States will be driven to seek perpetual peace in a civil constitution founded upon law. In 1794, a hundred and fifty years before the framing of the United Nations charter by the representatives of fifty nations at San Francisco, Kant wrote on *Perpetual Peace*. He was preceded by William Penn in 1693 in an *Essay Toward the Present and Future Peace of Europe* as one of a long line of writers who for some five centuries were reaching out toward the realization of a world federally organized for peace.

---

[24] Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason,* New York, Macmillan, 1928, pref. p. xxiv. With incredible confidence Kant writes: In this book I venture to maintain that there ought not to be one single metaphysical problem that has not been solved here, or for the solution of which the key at least has not been supplied.

[25] Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Practical Reason and other works on the Theory of Ethics,* Macmillan, 1928, p. 221.

Schelling (1775-1854) accepts Kant's thought that the realization of a perfect political constitution, or State, is the object of history, and believes in a universal peace realized in "a parliament of man, a federation of the world." History is the evolution of the Absolute which expresses itself in individual freedom, in men as fellow workers with God, working out a magnificent symphony, or poem, or drama. History, though it represents a long conflict between self-will and the universal will, is the gradual self-revelation of God. Its center is in the Incarnation of Christ.

Leopold von Ranke, (1825-1871), led a new group of scientific historians in Germany who sought the key to the understanding of history, not in supernatural but in natural causation, to explain the events of the present. With B. G. Niebuhr, he founded the method of modern, objective, scientific, historical writing, based on source materials. Many historians now sought the key to the understanding of history in man's physical environment. Henry Thomas Buckle, in his

History of Civilization in England, tried to show that the mental and moral development of man was influenced by external forces of nature, such as geography and climate.

Sören Kierkegaard (1813-1855) was the father of the "dialectical" method and of his existential philosophy in which a person commits himself totally to the claims of the Absolute regardless of the cost involved. The existential is opposed to the "spectator attitude" of science and speculative philosophy. The supremacy of religion is exalted in the sharp contrast between man's imperfection and the absolute righteousness of God, the "wholly other." The relation of the individual to God involves suffering: "I suffer, therefore I am." God, the Divine Absolute, stands wholly outside the historical process, but Kierkegaard's terrestrial pessimism ends in celestial optimism. His influence on later generations of European thought was profound. Karl Barth espoused his doctrine of crisis, introduced him to Europe, and re-interpreted him to the world in his *Epistle to the Romans.* The Barthian movement has deepened the religious life of western Europe, but has caused a decline of interest in the human processes of history and has reasserted a dualism that relegates religion to the suprahistorical. It has not strengthened the social implications of Christianity nor man's sense of responsibility for building a better social order. God, by his total "otherness," is almost excluded from history.

The most brilliant of contemporary theological writers is Reinhold Niebuhr. He is at his best in his Gifford Lectures on *The Nature and Destiny of Man.* Everything in human life and history moves towards an end and all things move toward both fulfillment and dissolution. The Kingdom of God *has come* in Christ, disclosing the meaning of history, but it *is to come* only in the culmination of history. The light of revelation of the meaning of life illumines the darkness of history's self-contradictions, and its fragmentary realizations of meaning. All history as we know it is an "interim" between the disclosure and the fulfillment of its meaning.

The entrance of Christ into history and his final triumph express the Christian faith in the sufficiency of God's sovereignty over the world and history. True Christian faith refutes both a shallow utopianism and the escape of otherworldliness. The consummation of history lies beyond the temporal process: in eternity, not in time. History is not meaningless because it cannot complete itself. It is tragic, however, because men always seek prematurely to complete it, as by the identification of the Roman Catholic Church with the Kingdom of God, and the classless society of the Russian Revolution with the consummation of history.

With the whole group of theological realists. Niebuhr has moved to the left in social theory but to the right in theological orthodoxy. He has a deep and prophetic sense of man's sin. He holds that God cannot destroy evil except by taking it into and upon himself. That means that emphatically God is in history, in both creation and redemption, in the Incarnation, in the Atonement, and in the Resurrection of the living Christ, now the Head of the Church. History cannot redeem itself, for a nontheistic humanism is impotent. God only is the redeemer of history. Niebuhr holds that "all the known facts of history verify the interpretation of human destiny implied in New Testament eschatology."[26]

The Russian-born Nicolas Berdyaev interprets the meaning of history in the light of the agony of the Russian Revolution and of the calamity experienced by the Russian Orthodox Church. In his *End of Our Time,* 1933, *Christianity and Class War,* 1933, *The Destiny of Man,* 1937, and *The Origin of Russian Communism,* 1937, he shows that he interprets history in the light of Christian eschatology. Tragic terrestrial history will be swallowed up in victorious celestial history.Human suffering only reflects the suffering in the heart of God. In the Incarnation, God breaks through into the material world in the God-Man, Christ, to share with man the tragedy of his free, sinful, and fallen existence. Berdyaev, like Niebuhr, believes that though Christ inaugurated a new era in history, man will not know God's final victory within the limits of time and God's Kingdom will not fully come on earth.

---

[26] *The Nature and Destiny of Man,* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943, Vol. II, pp. 287-321.

According to Berdyaev, the Russian Revolution was a calamity permitted by the divine wisdom of God. A perusal of the Czarina's letters to the last Czar and similar documents shows that the old regime stood condemned and that the revolution was inevitable and predestined. Any restoration of the old order is impossible; Russia must go on to new life under a new Marxian Leninism further corrected and enriched by experience. Every revolution, like the French and Russian volcanic upheavals, is at first violent, barbarous, and destructive, but it begets forces that free and purge it of its early excesses. In every bourgeois democracy there is class war, as one class of possessors seeks to dominate the dispossessed under a political masquerade. Capitalism is not and cannot be a true democracy. Such democracy is formal rather than real for it can not and will not give justice to all. The old Moscow was possessed by the messianic idea. Russia sought a kingdom founded on justice. The monstrous injustice and human suffering occasioned by poverty in Russia made the reforms of Peter the Great inevitable as were those of Lenin and Stalin later. Peter, like Lenin and Stalin, with barbaric violence, insisted on the forcible application of principles of reform from above downwards.

Berdyaev believes that Marx, who was obsessed by the evil of exploitation as was the prophet Amos, deduced an ethical prophetic remedy for justice, liberty, equality, and fraternity. Marx, who never saw the real proletariat, substituted an idealized messianic proletariat as the instrument of revolution. He counted religion, which he never understood, opium, and Communism as a dictatorship was necessarily hostile to all religion, for it could not countenance a divided allegiance between two masters. In Russia, in the so-called democracies, and in the world as a whole, God is working out his purposes in tragic history which will be realized fully only beyond it. In this view, Niebuhr, Tillich, and all the theological realists would agree in their philosophy of history.

CHAPTER V

GOD IN MODERN HISTORY

---

1. The Crises of History

Since we are endeavoring to make our study of God in history in a time of world crisis, it may give us perspective if we recall other great crises in the past, such as the failure of Jewish nationalism in the time of Jeremiah, the failure of the Law at the time of Jesus, the fall of Greece, the fall of Rome, and the collapse of feudalism at the time of the French Revolution.We recall the crisis at the downfall of the Jewish nation in captivity and dispersion. The destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple looked like the end of the ages to the devout Jew, but Jeremiah, undismayed, looks beyond the end of the Old Covenant and foretells the coming of a universal New Covenant. The downfall of Greece, which Plato foresaw at the trial and death of Socrates, seemed the doom of civilization, but Plato in faith writes his great *Republic* that envisions a new social order. The failure and seeming end of the Law and the prophets at the time of Jesus only marked the close of one epoch and the beginning of a new, creative and universal one that divided all history in twain.

The Renaissance and the Reformation

It may help us to understand our own situation if we view the present crisis in Western history as the third in a series of which the first was the fall of the Roman Empire, and the second was the decay of feudalism and the rise of our own bourgeois democracy. The fall of Rome and the end of the Pax Romana as the basis of contemporary civilization seemed to be the end of the world for men of that day. Augustine, however, the greatest philosopher of Christian history, realized that Christianity gave an eternal perspective which possessed an interpretation of life and history that made it possible to anticipate and see beyond such periodic catastrophes. The more spiritually stable and universal church survived the downfall of the Empire, and men endeavored to build the new medieval society upon Christian principles as Augustine had defined them, including justice, Christian brotherhood, some measure of spiritual freedom, and above all, love to God and man expressed in loyalty in religion. Medieval Christianity, however, interpreted these principles in terms of the contemporary feudal-agrarian society as absolute and final, just as modern Protestantism tends to interpret these principles within the framework of bourgeois capitalism described as "free enterprise."

Medieval society could not absorb the new factors of expanding commerce and the new nationalism which were ushering in an industrial civilization. Both by processes of evolution and revolution—including the revolution under Cromwell in England, the American Revolution of 1776, and the French Revolution of 1789—medieval Christendom was succeeded by the modern industrial era. Every great crisis in world history represents the breakdown in the organization of the civilization and of the culture of a period. Throughout this book we shall understand that a culture is the spirit or soul of a civilization, and that civilization is the body of a culture. A culture includes the moral and spiritual as well as the intellectual and esthetic aspects of life, that is, the religious, the philosophical, and artistic ideas which tend to mold the political organization.[1]

A civilization is based upon political, economic, and social mechanisms and organization. If the culture were adequate and based upon all the four principles we have mentioned and if it could adapt itself to its changing environment and absorb all the new elements of life as they arose, there would be no periodic breakdowns in civilization. When the culture proves inadequate, however, and unable to provide the good life for the majority or make provision for progress, a breakdown occurs and men are forced to seek to build a new and better civilization. Therefore every major crisis or revolution carries the potentiality of the destruction of the evil and obsolete elements in the old order, and, if men have learned their lesson and discerned the signs of the times, the possible creation of a new order, better calculated to realize justice, brotherhood, liberty, and love. Every major crisis in history, including the present one, is both a menace and a promise.

---

[1] We are indebted here to "A Faith for History's Greatest Crisis" by Reinhold Niebuhr, in *Fortune,* July, 1942.

It may also help us to diagnose our present ills if we recall the two great movements or crises which marked the transition from the medieval to the modern world, the Renaissance and the Reformation. Whatever their similarities, the two were poles apart in their main emphasis. The Renaissance criticized the medieval church as too tyrannical and pessimistic. Its emphasis was so exclusively upon individual liberty that liberty tended to become license. It broke the fetters of religious authority and superstition. Its emancipated mind sought to explore nature and man and gave an optimistic report of human nature and history. It resented all obsolete notions of man's fall and of sin. The Renaissance man believed himself to be by nature good, and even perfectible. He was sure he could easily emancipate himself, discover the hidden secrets of science, and build a harmonious society. John Dewey and many humanists today are the late progeny of the Renaissance.

Man was further flattered by the emancipation of the Enlightenment and by the optimistic beliefs of Romanticism. Then the discovery of the theory of evolution seemed to promise almost automatic progress. Whether under the positivism of Compte, or modern naturalism and rationalism, modern man felt he could well afford to drop the antiquated and uncomfortable factor of religion and he had no need of God even as an hypothesis. According to laissez-faire social philosophies of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, all conflicting interests in society would result in harmony if only men were left alone: "Each man seeking his own would serve the commonweal" and thus promote "the greatest good of the greatest number." All these theories flattered man and justified unrestrained selfishness. All resulted in false estimates of man and of history. The whole of modern utopianism was implicit in the Renaissance.

Unlike nature, history has no natural balances of power. Power, whether economic, political, or ecclesiastical, always tends to dominate weakness, and injustice results. Trust in reason underlies man's faith in history which reason is supposed progressively to dominate. Finally, in the modern world, the Renaissance, which trusted in history, triumphed over the Reformation, because all our brilliant material achievements seemed to imply moral progress. We shall find that there is normally progress in history in the sense of improving technics, growing knowledge, and increasing areas of human co-operation as in the industrial world, but these do not imply moral progress. Evil elements in human history appear on every new level of achievement. History is filled with endless possibilities, but they are possibilities both of good and of evil. History does not solve our problems, for it is itself our chief problem—that is, self-centered man is our problem.

Opposed to the Renaissance, the Reformation regarded the medieval Catholic interpretation of life and history as too optimistic. Luther did not believe there could ever be truly "Christian" societies, or governments, or economic arrangements free from the sinful corruption by which all human enterprises, including even the church and all religious institutions, were tainted. To the complexities of culture and civilization, the Lutheran Reformation took a defeatist attitude, especially in the matter of realizing justice in the collective life of man. Luther denied the relevance between the demands of perfect love in the Kingdom of God and any political or economic system. The gospel was in heaven and the law on earth. The church was heavenly and the state earthly, hence he said: "In civil policy and obedience to law . . . nothing must be known concerning the conscience, the gospel, grace, remission of sins, heavenly righteousness, or Christ himself." All the obligations of justice, brotherhood, or liberty were thus severed from religion which should be their chief motivation and dynamic, and no obligation rested on the Christian to change the social order. This defeatism and dualism in Luther's position he consistently applied in the peasant revolt for social justice in which he maintained a complete separation between the "spiritual kingdom" and the sinful "worldly" one.[2]

Luther's whole defeatist ethics and the complete dualism of two different standards for church and state encouraged tyranny and had a fateful consequence in the history of German civilization. At its best, however, the Reformation tried to do away with the abuses and superstitions that had been superimposed upon the primitive Christian faith, and endeavored to restore Christianity to its early purity and power. It furnished the culmination of the prophetic interpretation of history and restored the transcendent viewpoint from which we may judge history and find its meaning. Luther's doctrine of the priesthood of all believers "worked like dynamite for spiritual, intellectual, and political liberty in the Old World and the New, and unwittingly helped to lay the foundation of modern democracy. Despite all the limitations and crudities of Martin Luther, in him we can see God working in history both destructively and constructively.

---

[2] Luther held that the peasants' demand for justice and the abolition of serfdom "would make all men equal and so change the spiritual Kingdom of Christ into an external worldly one. Impossible! An earthly kingdom cannot exist without inequality of persons. . . . It is a malicious and evil idea that serfdom should be abolished because Christ has made us free. This refers only to spiritual freedom given to us by Christ in order to enable us to withstand the devil." Luther's *Works,* Weimar ed. Vol. 18, pp. 326, 333.

SECULARISM AND SEPARATION FROM GOD

Though the revolt had long been gathering, in the Renaissance individual leaders began to break away from the authority of the autocratic Church of the Middle Ages which did not and dared not permit freedom, and whose final typical response to the Renaissance and the Reformation was the torture of the Inquisition. In its negative aspect, the Renaissance was a repudiation of the ecclesiastical and feudal tyranny of the universal church and the universal state, or what remained of the Holy Roman Empire. The Renaissance was also a positive rebirth, a revival of learning, marked by the emergence of modern nations and languages—an age of invention, of discovery, of world exploration. It was a reassertion of the natural rights of reason and the senses toward the conquest of the planet as a place of human habitation. Men revolted from the long tyranny of medieval orthodoxy with its ever-threatening penalties of eternal doom for heresy. The rediscovery of the classic past provoked inquiry, encouraged criticism, and restored man's confidence in his own faculties as he strove for spiritual freedom. The endeavor of man to reconstitute himself as a free being meant the birth of a new humanism, and a new discovery of man's almost illimitable possibilities. All this was desirable and inevitable. As there was an advance toward justice, toward brotherhood, toward liberty, and ultimately toward religion of a higher type—both in the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation—we believe that God was in the history of the Renaissance. But grave evils developed.

As men broke away from the Catholic Church, they tended to leave religion altogether. As they left the once-united empire, they set up rival and warring nationalities, each in danger of selfish isolation in a growing world anarchy. *As they left the unity of ecumenical Christendom, they were driven toward a centrifugal sectarianism and toward rampant individualism that left God out of life in all departments of* *knowledge.* Life that had been simple and unified now became departmentalized, and one by one each segment of life and each science broke away from the center of an integrated and organized body of learning into what sometimes became an autonomous fragment of a godless secularism. Modernism not only repudiated the undoubted evils but lost many of the priceless values of Christendom. We can trace this process of fragmentation and isolation in philosophy, in each separate science, in politics, in economics and the business world, in art, in literature, in education, and in religion itself.

We may begin with modern philosophy, since that affected all other aspects of knowledge. William Temple goes so far as to say that in his opinion the most disastrous moment in the history of Europe was when Descartes took the wrong turn and got a false start, at the birth of modern philosophy. Descartes begins with an artificial doubt and with his irreducible minimum of thought, *cogito, ergo sum.* When he says, "I think, therefore I am," we notice the obtrusive, twice-repeated first personal pronoun. Descartes begins and ends with himself and never really gets beyond himself. He begins and ends with an abstraction severed from reality. He would have been on the bed-rock of reality if he had begun with the irreducible basis of all thought, the subject-object relationship: "I think such and such realities."[3]

---

[3] William Temple's *Nature, Man and God,* Toronto, Macmillan, 1935, The Cartesian Faux-pas, pp. 57-59. Doctor Temple and Baron von Hügel show that all experience is always three-fold: experience of the subject, of the object, and of the over-bridging thought. When man artificially excludes a third of every living experience, and isolates himself from the universe, he imprisons himself in his own faculties with disastrous consequences. Continental Europe followed Descartes' rationalism in the incoherence of the great Spinoza, while for the brilliant Leibniz, each mind is a "monad," a self-contained unit, and the "pre-established harmony" is between monad and monad. The English followed Descartes in the empirical criticism of Locke, Berkeley, and Hume. Berkeley abolished independent objective existence altogether. Then Hume followed and showed that on the basis of Descartes' bias in philosophy, there was no ground for believing in the mind itself, and nothing was left but a flux of uncertain ideas. Even Kant, who now took up the quest of truth, never rejected the fatal hypothesis of Descartes that the mind deals directly, not with objects known, but with its own ideas, while things in themselves remain unknowable. This is not to deny the vast amount of good in Descartes' devising the critical method that furnished the instrument we needed, nor

Having started with himself, he concludes that the mind knows nothing directly except its own ideas. Descartes was a professed Catholic, so he revives the arguments for the existence of God and proves to his own satisfaction that God is a being of perfect goodness, wisdom, and power. Since God would not deceive us, our senses must not be false in testifying to an objective world of reality. But from his false start, Descartes is left in a vicious circle of subjective ideas, really sure of nothing but himself. Self becomes the false center of all life. With his bias for exact mathematics, mathematical ideas now become pre-eminent and men trust the world most in its material, measurable aspects. Descartes starts philosophy and science on the path of segregated secularism by his first principle: "Never to accept anything for true which I did not clearly know to be such." To science God would soon be "an unnecessary hypothesis."

Once philosophy had made this false start, it was but natural that all departments of knowledge and life should do likewise. Luther stands for the principle of "private judgment" as much as does Descartes. When Luther set his conscience against the whole authority of the organized Catholic Church it was one of the most splendid and decisive moments of history. But when Luther asserts the principle of individualism that characterized the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the whole modern world, neither he as a Protestant, nor Descartes as a Catholic, could possibly realize all the evil that rampant and ruthless individualism was to work in the four centuries that were to follow. Protestantism became individualized and atomized, productive of disruption and disunion in several hundred ever-multiplying sects. It led to an age of individualism in politics, with its unmitigated assertion of national independence, culminating in

---

Spinoza's religious passion in the Fifth Book of his *Ethics*, nor our debt to Kant and the other philosophers mentioned. We must object, however, to the initial assumption that in knowledge the mind begins with itself and proceeds to the uncertain apprehension of the external world only by inference.

the motto, "My country, right or wrong." In economic laissez-faire, where "business is business" and would brook no interference, the money power sought to dominate the state and produced the economy of materialistic and selfish capitalism. In science, which was breaking loose from all restraint under the able advocacy of Francis Bacon, men were entering upon the all-embracing experiment in doubt, which Descartes had inaugurated.

In no sphere was the break from religious authority clearer than in politics, where the breach with the old order was first openly proclaimed. Here Machiavelli (1469-1527) was the pioneer, and stated with a frank lucidity that seemed indecent the autonomy of the whole world of politics, with its declaration of independence of the moral law. He founded the science of politics for the modern world when he wrote *The Prince* more than four hundred and thirty years ago. Machiavelli was not a sordid grafter but a patriot who desired the unification of Italy. Versatile diplomat, soldier, historian, poet, and dramatist, Machiavelli was better than the majority of his countrymen at the time. But for him the political state was its own end and it was responsible to no one; its isolated selfish interests were its only obligation. Machiavelli drew his conclusions from the nature of mankind, "ascribing all things to natural causes or to fortune." God is simply left out of politics and of life; men are only political beings; religion as part of the state machinery is useful only for keeping men in order. *The Prince* gives a vivid picture of political conditions in Renaissance Italy, and the Italians were amazed at the moral condemnation by Europe of Machiavelli whose name became a synonym for all that is diabolical in public and private policy. Lord Macaulay tries to defend him but admits that "his opinions had not escaped the contagion of that political immorality which was common among his countrymen," and doubts whether any name in literary history is so generally odious: "Such a display of wickedness, naked yet not ashamed, such cool, judicious, scientific atrocity, seemed rather to belong to a fiend than to the most depraved of men."

It is sad to think that politics in the Renaissance, in modern Italy and in the political machines of America today, have so fully followed Machiavelli's principles and practices. Were it desirable, we could name politicians in our own day in America—in New York, in New Jersey, in Kansas City, or in Chicago—Democrats or Republicans, in prison or out, who have stained the fair name of America and made its politics a stench in the nostrils of the world. This only shows what politics, or business, or history itself becomes when God is left out. And this in part explains America's lack of moral leadership in the present desperate world crisis when our country should have been, in the words of Lincoln, "the last best hope of earth." There is neither statesmanship, nor sagacity, nor moral leadership amid the awful dangers of the atomic age, when petty politicians leave God out of life, except in name, and become presidents, senators, national or international leaders.

The secularization of life without God as one of the negative end-results of the Renaissance and the philosophy of Descartes are observable in many of the secular writers of the nineteenth century and in the philosophies of men like Freud and Spengler. Sigmund Freud revealed to an age suffering from the morbid effects of sour puritanism the primal energy of sex in infancy and adolescence and showed the role of sexual shock and repression in the development of the whole personality. To the repressed side of life, he gave the name of the unconscious and helped us to realize the depths as well as the heights of the human personality with its drives, desires, and lusts. He showed that the very motive force of self-realization is love: love of the ego and love of others which springs from the primal urge toward reproduction.

Unfortunately Freud could not see that all human love springs from God. His brilliance as a psychologist was crippled by his mediocrity as a philosopher. He took over uncritically the atomic materialism of his scientific age and thought that the individual was a self-contained unit upon whom society imposed standards which acted as a censor and led to repressions and festering complexes. From the standpoint of his secularized, materialistic, self-sufficient individualism, art was a mere escape mechanism, philosophy only a rationalization, and "religion an outright fraud," or "a gigantic vermiform appendix." Man could look to science alone for his emancipation. C. G. Jung, Otto Rank, and other psychologists had to open the way for the fuller realization of the value of man's deeper and larger personality, that the bitter prejudices of a Freud and the later banal materialistic behaviorism of a J. B. Watson could not comprehend. Freud advocated the relaxation of all tensions, but he could not see that the unlimited self-assertion of the egocentric, godless individual leads to the destruction of personality.

Once Descartes had begun with his egocentric "I think; therefore I am," philosophy and science logically led on to scientists like Laplace who, after surveying the heavens with the telescope and the earth with the microscope, found no need of the hypothesis of God. The result is that multitudes today are left in a secular world without God. Rousseau, in his *Social Contract,* faces this problem and suggests for its solution a civic religion with "a few simple dogmas." His followers felt this need when they set up the worship of the Goddess of Reason in the church of the Madelaine in place of the worship of God. Harold Laski, in his thoughtful and helpful *Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time,* admits frankly that our present secularism raises a staggering problem:

> The secularization of society is a final achievement in the evolution of mankind. It will extend and not diminish its power. The faith we have to build is in the values of this world, not in the values of another. The claim we have to establish is that of man upon the brother that he sees, not the claim of the unseen God upon man. It is, no doubt, a problem of gigantic propor-

tions; it means the moralization of an increasingly anthropocentric universe.[4]

Laski sees that "a civilization built upon the mere growth of material power will break down, as ours is breaking down," but he knows of no remedy

We could multiply quotations from contemporary literature to show the secularism of the modern world and its results. Man cannot serve two masters, both God and Mammon. And our whole basic economic order is secular and materialistic. It demands laissez-faire, to be "let alone" by God as well as by man's government, just as Machiavelli's *Prince* demanded that his rotten politics be let alone by God and man. There are evidences on every hand of a secularized decaying economic order that marks the end of an age. Almost everywhere there are signs of revolution in Europe where the old order has already broken. And there are signs of world revolution where the economic order of capitalism is going the way of all flesh, just as the economies of slavery and feudalism did before it. These three orders were doomed to fall because they were for the privilege of the few against the welfare of the many. They would not and could not give justice to all, for irresponsible freedom and special privilege for the few is incompatible with the welfare of the many and justice for all. Economics as well as every other area of life drives us back to our four principles. Whether under the type of capitalism in America, or of the mild socialism of Great Britain, or under the Soviet ideal of communism in Russia, the trend is towards a socialized planned economy of a new order.

Lewis Mumford says in *The Condition of Man*: "The world has regressed so far toward political barbarism that it is scarcely conscious of its present degradation."[5] But whether in the economic or the political field, in America, Britain, or Russia, our age is characterized not by religious faith but by secularism. And secularism means separation from God. It denies the fact of God in history.

---

[4] Harold Laski, *Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time*, New York, Viking Press, 1943, p. 197.

[5] Lewis Mumford, *The Condition of Man*, New York, Harcourt Brace and Co., Inc., 1944, p. 359. See Mumford's discussion of Freud and Spengler under "Barbarism and Dissolution," pp. 360-381.

2. Is God in Anglo-Saxon History?

Having glanced all too briefly at some of the crises that mark the transition from the ancient to the modern world, we must, in this section and the one that follows, turn to the consideration of the thought of God at work in contemporary history. Some of us will not find it easy going here. Even if we think we can see God at work in the preparation of the ancient world in Ur, Egypt, Palestine, Greece, and Rome, it may shock some of us if we maintain that God is at work, not only in America but also in Soviet Russia, in our own day. Some may be prepared to ask, "Can any good thing come out of Communist and atheist Russia?"—just as suspicious Soviet citizens may ask, "Can any good thing come out of capitalist America?"

We shall apply our criterion of criticism to the "Big Three" that won the war who now find it so difficult to hold together to win the peace. In asking how far the Anglo-Saxon nations on the one hand, and Russia on the other, have maintained the principles of justice, brotherhood, liberty, and love to God and man for which true religion stands, we shall endeavor to show that Anglo-Saxon leaders have prevailingly stood for liberty and the maintenance of true religion, as they understand these, but that they have failed disastrously to realize economic justice or racial brotherhood. On the other hand, the present leaders of the Soviet Union have tried to stand, passionately and consistently, for economic justice and equal racial brotherhood—as *they* understand these—but they have failed to give, or even conceive of, adequate liberty in the four freedoms, or to stand for the maintenance of true religion or the love of God in the frankly professed atheism of their police state.

Anglo-Saxons, in striving to assert individual freedom, seem to have sacrificed social integrity and group unity. The Russians, in maintaining their collectivist economy under a dictatorship, have seemed to us to have submerged the individual in the mass, in a collectivist system to which the free Anglo-Saxon would never give his consent. From our point of view, we cannot see that the Russians have ever known true liberty—whether in Czarist or in Soviet Russia—while the Soviet citizen cannot see that capitalism has ever given economic justice or recognized real brotherhood for the poor or for segregated and exploited racial groups. If the will of God for all men is that all four of our values or cardinal principles shall be realized, then it may be that our task is to see that the values that each nation has achieved are preserved and the defects of each are remedied in order that all four principles may be realized in history. Perhaps the individual may find true freedom, not in isolation nor in the license of his boasted "rugged individualism," but in fellowship and the merging of his life with his fellow men. And the collective may find that its end is reached not in materialistic mass-man trying to live by bread alone, but in the end-product of the free and fully developed personalities of its citizens. It may be that these two social orders of capitalism and collective socialism represent opposite halfs of truth, but that real truth lies only in its wholeness. And this truth may not be realized by two blocs, an Eastern and a Western, mutually suspicious and both arming in self-defence, but in the effort to build one world in common loyalty to the United Nations. This is the thread of thought that we shall endeavor to preserve in this section.

IN ENGLISH HISTORY

If the Anglo-Saxons have prevailingly failed in the matter of our first two principles—that is in economic justice and racial brotherhood—this has surely not been because of any racial or national defect, but because complete justice and brotherhood have never been realized and have been almost impossible of realization under the three successive social systems of slavery, feudalism, and of either laissez-faire or monopolistic capitalism. Americans may perhaps more readily see these defects in the English people than in themselves. Britain passed through a period of slavery, both for white and black. As late as the tenth century, the common man was a cheap commodity. The price of a linen shirt was equal to that of a slave (white), and a fine piece of armor was worth ten serfs, or fifty head of cattle. Until the conscience of Britain was aroused, the British were the most enterprising in the lucrative African slave trade. Slavery, however, gradually gave place to serfdom and that to poverty for the masses. The British Labor Party holds that serfdom was succeeded by "wage slavery" under laissez-faire exploitation until, after more than a century of struggle, British labor finally won the undisputed right of collective bargaining. Full justice and equal brotherhood were almost impossible under any of the above three economic and political systems.[6]

A passionate love of liberty and devotion to religion on the part of the best of Britain's leaders may be traced through their history for more than a thousand years. King Alfred, (848?-900), the first and greatest king of a united England, Edward the Confessor, (1042-1066), the best of English kings, stood for liberty and devotion to religion. God was in history, however, working not only through good kings like Alfred and Edward, but in England's meanest king, John (1167-1216). In selfishness, cruelty, and tyranny—his court a brothel where no woman was safe—John tried to rob England of her dearly bought liberties. Immediately representatives of church and state resisted him to the death. On June 15, 1215, at Runnymede, the Great Charter was discussed, agreed to, and signed in a single day. England was the first country in the modern world to become a legal, not a regal, state. English liberties were henceforth based on a written charter, upon law and order, and elected parliaments.[7] Because God was in history these liberties of England were destined to become the prized possession of the American Colonies, then of Europe, Asia, Africa, and some day of the world.

---

[6] See Gilbert Stone's *A History of Labour,* pp. 25-30; Sidney Webb's *History of Trade Unionism;* J. L. and Barbara Hammond's *The Town Labourer,* and *The Village Labourer* (1911); also the author's *The New World of Labor,* 1923, pp. 109-148.

Through more than a thousand years of Anglo-Saxon history, the best leaders of Britain have stood for liberty and loyalty to religion. The tough Anglo-Saxon peoples were not a "superior" race, but they stood for two superior principles and this was their significance for the world. To the Great Charter may be traced the origin of effective parliaments, of modern constitutional government, and the control of the purse, used as a lever by the Commons. Britain established relatively free colonies, with free trade, a free press, freedom of conscience, and freedom even for revolution. Never having had a leveling violent social revolution, however, the British are organized in a vast hierarchy of classes, still backward in social democracy, and race prejudice has always colored their colonial imperialism.

THE AMERICAN DREAM

However glaring the evils that persist in our American civilization, they must not blind us to our noble heritage. Anyone who believes in God at all can believe that he has been active throughout American history. Under God the discoveries of Columbus changed the course of history, they doubled the size of man's physical world and widened his mental horizon beyond the expectations of that age. With a strange reliance upon a passage in scripture, Columbus, whatever his limitations, humbly believed that no one could make the needed geographical discoveries "save by the Divine Will." As a mystic, reminded of his name Christopher, the "Christ-bearer," he believed himself to be the instrument of divine providence. He landed in the new world with the cross upon his banners "which the Admiral took in all the ships as a sign."

---

[7] *Magna Carta,* after recognizing the liberty of the church, passes on to deal with the rights of Englishmen at large—their claim to justice, to security of person and property, and to good government. The rights which the barons claimed for themselves they claimed for the nation. The boon of free and unbought justice was a boon for all, and a special provision protected the right of the poor.

The Spaniards with their greed for gold and slaves, however, and their ruthless destruction in Mexico, and the French under the Bourbon tyranny, were not permitted in the providence of God to open up North America. Anglo-Saxons, with deeper moral vision, saw in America a "New World," perhaps unique in history, where men hoped to make a fresh start for the building of a better social order in "the land of the free." Unique in the world of that day were the persecuted Pilgrims of Plymouth, the Puritans in their incredibly bold effort to establish a theocracy in Massachusetts Bay, Roger Williams with his dream of the most complete religious and civil liberty ever known in the world in Rhode Island, the long oppressed Quakers and Pietists under William Penn, as well as the followers of John Wesley, George Whitefield, and Governor Oglethorpe of Georgia, and of Lord Baltimore and his devout company of Catholics in Maryland, driven from England by religious persecution. The most far-sighted leaders had a high religious purpose in coming to America. Many of these owed their religious convictions to the reformers—John Wycliffe, Martin Luther, and John Calvin. As we have seen, Luther's doctrine of the priesthood of all believers worked like dynamite for spiritual, intellectual, and political liberty in the old world and the new. All three reformers contributed to the birth of the Puritan movement that accompanied the disruption of English feudal life, and that was to achieve full freedom in the open frontier of the new world. Thus religiously, economically, and politically, America was to become a new world.

The American Dream became cumulatively articulate in the *Mayflower* Compact, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and in the state papers of the great presidents. No country was ever founded on deeper religious foundations than the United States. It is no wonder that John Adams wrote in 1765:

> I always consider the settlement of America with reverence and wonder, as the opening of a grand scene and design in Providence for the illumination of the ignorant and the emancipation of the slavish part of mankind *all over the earth.*[8]

Even Benjamin Franklin concluded that the Constitution, with all its compromises, had been "influenced, guided, and governed by that omnipotent, omnipresent, and beneficient Ruler in whom all inferior spirits live and move and have their being." It was Franklin who on June 28, 1775, urged that the Constitutional Convention should open its sessions with prayer. He said: "The longer I live the more convincing proofs I see that *God governs in the affairs of men.* And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid?" It is just because America has held the promise of "a *new* world," a "door of hope," *"for the emancipation of mankind all over the earth,"* that so many believe they can see God at work in American history. And this, rather than the underworld of crime and the corrupt political bosses, is the true America whose high destiny every loyal citizen must try to realize. This is implied in the flag salute where we seek to hold before our school children and citizens the real America:

> I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America,
> And to the Republic for which it stands,
> One Nation, indivisible
> With liberty and justice for all.

REALISTIC AMERICAN HISTORY

The greatest leaders of America, from such Founding Fathers as John Adams and Benjamin Franklin, to Abraham

---

[8] John Adams, *Works,* I, p. 66 (italics ours).

Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson, have believed that God was working throughout our history. Just as the dominant figures of British history have stood for liberty and loyalty to religion so have our best American leaders. But like the British we have failed to give economic justice and to recognize the equal racial brotherhood of all. Our four principles or cornerstones of an enduring social order must become touchstones to test any society or nation at a given point in history. Let us pause to test our American society by these first two principles of justice and brotherhood.

Let us take first the touchstone of justice. America has certainly prospered on this virgin continent, with the greatest natural resources in the world. She stands today the richest country ever known in history. We may estimate our wealth at over four hundred billion dollars[9] and our gross national income following the height of the war boom as approximately $200,000,000, or more than twice the national income at the peak of the Coolidge boom in 1929. We must ask, however, with what measure of justice our system of capitalism has distributed or shared this colossal wealth and income. We have in this favored Christian land four families and a number of corporations in the billionaire class. Side by side with this vast wealth, a third or a fourth of our people are ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed. We have over ten million of our population living in slums, urban and rural. We have denied the vote to some ten millions of our citizens, because they are Negro or poor white, by poll tax or other evasions. According to our Commissioner of Education we have left ten millions in illiteracy.

On the crest of the Coolidge Wall Street boom, Henry

---

[9] This was the amount claimed by Calvin Coolidge in his Kansas City address, November 11, 1926. Even at that time the United States had more than a third of the world's railway mileage and of its developed water power. We were producing over half of the world's iron, steel, copper, zinc, timber, paper, and other essentials. We have now the bulk of the world's gold supply and of its streamlined modern industrial plants, unscathed by a war that devastated Europe and much of Asia. At the close of the war, we possess perhaps a quarter of the entire wealth of the world and about half of its industrial capacity.

Ford's fortune had reached approximately two billion dollars and his annual income approximated $80,000,000, or $220,000 a day.[10] During the same years the average annual income of some eight million sharecroppers and tenant farmers in the South was from $38 to $87 *a year*.[11] Crime and racketeering have made a world's record. Given the selfish sinfulness of human nature, the private possession of social processes means that some men have inordinate social and economic power; and powerful men prevailingly take advantage of weak men, not as individuals but in the system which they dominate. Where our treasure is, there is our heart also. Entrenched power and privilege cannot see straight. They are blinded by the beam in their own eye which cannot see the sinful injustice of our system. If our economic injustice today is more monstrous than in the time of Amos or of Jesus, where does America stand, under the judgment of God, in the matter of justice?

The people of America have failed even more disastrously in the application of the principle of racial brotherhood than of economic justice. The first cargo of slaves was landed at Jamestown, Virginia, in 1619, a year before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock. After making a tour of the white and colored colleges in ten southern states in 1945 and 1946, the writer is convinced that there is more bitterness and more burning moral indignation in the heart of the Negroes in the States today than there has ever been in the three hundred and twenty-eight years since the first slaves were landed. The writer has found little difference between men as he has traveled over the world for fifty years, whether in the North or South, in the Occident or the Orient, among white or colored races. He is reminded of Thomas Carlyle's discerning judgment as between the South and the North: "The kindly South says to the Negro, 'God bless you, be a slave.' The colder North says, 'God damn you, be free!' " Neither treats the Negro as a brother.

---

[10] The New York *World* of February 4, 1927, estimated Ford's income as $80,000,000 or $11,415 an hour, or two hundred dollars a minute. If this was Ford's income, it was forty thousand times as much as that of one of his workers.

[11] According to the National Emergency Council in their report to President Roosevelt in 1940: "Earnings of sharecroppers ranged from $38 to $87 per person, and an income of $38 annually means only a little more than ten cents a day." According to the report of the Federal Trade Commission for 1926, one per cent of the people in America had 59 per cent of the wealth, while two per cent possessed 80 per cent of the wealth. In the year of 1929, 513 multimillionaires paid income tax on individual incomes of over a million dollars a year, while 23,000,000 poorer families were left with insufficient purchasing power to prevent the depression which followed. During 1929, 36,000 families received incomes of $75,000 or more, or a total of nearly ten billion dollars. That was approximately equal to the total income of nearly twelve million families with incomes under $1,500 a year. That means that one tenth of one per cent of the population of the United States received practically as much as forty-two per cent of the people on the lower income levels.

Maury Maverick of Texas, as a southern liberal, maintains that though slavery had been almost universally condemned, when it became profitable through the invention of the cotton gin, "then did the ruling class of the South find that God had ordained slavery." Professor William Sumner Jenkins in his *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South* shows, as a Southerner, that from 1820 to 1865 the thought, writing, teaching, and preaching of the solid South were awakened and unified in the defense of slavery as a "positive good." The argument was based solidly upon Scripture, reason, experience, economics, and science. Few of us realize how much of our thinking is wishful thinking, nor how many of our attitudes and convictions are prejudiced by our class, race, and religion.

Jefferson had spoken of the demoralizing effects of slavery on both races in his *Notes on Virginia,* saying: "I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever." A number of other countries freed their slaves without civil war, and America was left as the last and principal seat of slavery in the civilized world. Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, sealed by his own martyrdom and the death of six hundred thousand American citizens, ended chattel slavery as a legal institution. The violence of the Civil War, or the War Between the States, and the scandalous carpetbag and scalawag administration upon the helpless South, however, left a long-lasting inheritance of race prejudice and bitterness in this country.

The South, by the adoption of the Black Codes and by Jim Crow legislation, sought in effect to reconstitute slavery and to attain the same ends by means of discriminatory segregation. Eighteen of the states that had prohibited slavery passed civil rights statutes to prevent the spread of segregation and Jim Crowism as they had previously resisted slavery. *Segregation seems to the writer to be the sequel and the perpetuation of the spirit of slavery.* It fixes a gulf of effective separation between two races which leads to the false pride of the "superior" race and to a sense of humiliation, degradation and indignation of the segregated race. The absence of social contacts has increased mutual ignorance, suspicion, and social distance, and decreased mutual understanding and the development of common interests. It has a narrowing and stunting effect on both groups and leads to the frustration of the subordinate group. Instead of leading toward unity and order, it tends toward race riots and social chaos in city after city when race prejudice and hatred boil over both in the North and the South. We shall feel the full effects of this in the coming economic depression. Aubrey Williams, editor of the *Southern Farmer,* says: "A reign of terror in the South, where the forces of law are being turned against the Negro, is the worst thing that has happened in the past forty years. Negroes are crucified not once in a day but several times a day on trains, busses, wherever they live or seek to work."

Segregation denies spiritual, economic, political, educational, or social equality to the Negro and leads to the partial strangulation or moral suicide of that race. Racial persecution of the Jews in Europe and segregation of the Negro in America seem to be the most effective denial of the Christian doctrine of brotherhood that have yet appeared in the world. Ideally, Christ had broken down all walls of partition and segregation. In the new creation of a spiritual humanity there was to be no room for Jew or Gentile, for bond or freeman, white or black, yellow or brown. All belonged to one equal spiritual brotherhood. The Declaration of Independence tried to proclaim in secular language this spiritual truth that all men were created equal, "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

When the Carnegie Foundation wished to make the definitive study of the race problem in America, it called as an impartial investigator the great Swedish sociologist, Professor Gunnar Myrdal, assisted by a large and able staff of experts from the South and the North. The result of several years of intensive investigation was published in *An American Dilemma*.[12] Dr. Myrdal maintains that no nation was ever founded on such high ideals as was the United States upon what he calls "the American Creed," but that no nation has ever so betrayed its ideals as has America in its treatment of the Negro. This he calls our "greatest failure." He shows that the real problem is not the Negro, but it is the white man and his attitudes and prejudices which contradict his ideals and result in a guilty conscience as well as incalculable loss to both races.

The race problem is no mere local or sectional issue in a part of the United States, since two thirds of the population of the world are colored peoples. The white race has occupied all the best portions of the earth, exercising control over more than half of Asia and all but one thirtieth of the Continent of Africa. Looking at the world as a whole, we do not find that the feeling of race and color prejudice exists in any appreciable degree among the Slavic, or Scandinavian, or Latin peoples. Like an infection, it has spread, however, among the

---

[12] *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and American Democracy,* by Gunnar Myrdall, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1944, 2 vols., 1,483 pages. The book is an invaluable mine of information, an objective study of facts and attitudes. An effective abbreviated Digest of this may be obtained for ten cents from the Columbus Council for Democracy, 9 E. Long St., Columbus 15, Ohio.

German and Anglo-Saxon peoples. We are faced by the present *fact* of segregated, enforced inequality which stands out against the great *truth* of the ultimate spiritual equality of all men before God and of the infinite spiritual worth of every man made in the image of God. Yet in the face of our four ideals we continue to segregate, rob, and degrade the Negro.

I made the statement on my last tour among the colleges of ten southern states that should the conditions for a lasting peace require us to give equal justice to all and jobs to all by fair employment practices and to recognize the equal brotherhood of all, even *if that involved the surrender of "white supremacy" and the end of discriminatory segregation,* I had not found a college or a congregation in the South that would not prefer World War III to such a practice of what seemed to me real Christian brotherhood. Nowhere was the statement challenged.[13]

The thought is bound to occur to any thinking mind that if Communist Russians can recognize equal racial brotherhood, if all Mohammedans, Buddhists, Bahaists, and many other religionists do so, it is a strange fact if Christians who believe in "white supremacy" are the only ones who refuse to practice Christian brotherhood. We may continue to maintain our present attitudes of economic injustice and of race prejudice and segregation while the Russians will probably continue to seek to give equal economic justice—*as they understand it*—and to recognize "the equality and sovereignty" of all races. If God is in history at all, which will he be able to use—the U. S. A. or the U.S. S. R.—in the first two essential principles of economic justice and racial brotherhood "for the emancipation of mankind all over the earth"? If mankind is ever to be emancipated from race prejudice, it must include the land where Abraham Lincoln issued his Emancipation Proclamation in the last powerful seat of black slavery and the present center of race prejudice and segregation. If God is in history, and if he is a God of righteous love, then the way of emancipation from economic injustice and race prejudice must be by fulfilling the principles of justice and real brotherhood.

---

[13] The pamphlet on *The Races of Mankind* was not allowed to be circulated among the soldiers of World War II because it revealed that the median scores in the intelligence tests given to the American Expeditionary Forces of World War I were as follows: Southern Whites in Mississippi 41.25, in Kentucky 41.50, in Arkansas 41.55; Northern Negroes in New York State 45.02, in Illinois 47.35, and in Ohio 49.50. Such figures did not seem to justify "white supremacy." One white boy averred: "I was sixteen years old 'fore I knowed I was any better'n a nigger." This is on the same cultural and moral level as Senator Bilbo's speeches to defend white supremacy by absolute segregation, as he vilified "niggers" during his filibuster against the Fair Employment Practices bill.

Based on scriptural principles, we believe the way out of this impasse for every believer in God—Protestant, Catholic, or Jew, white or black—is *simply to practice equal justice and racial brotherhood motivated by Christian love, refusing to recognize walls or gulfs of separation, segregation, and prejudice.* This principle applies equally to white and colored, both motivated by love and using the technique of nonviolence. If one is a Christian, let him be a Christian in his attitude to "the brother for whom Christ died." And if he is a loyal American, let him follow the Declaration of Independence and keep the Constitution as amended to include the Bill of Rights which seeks to protect the Negro as a citizen. Even amid the darkness of economic injustice and race prejudice, we believe that God is in history to the extent that the sunlight pierces the smoke and gloom of the slums of our great industrial cities. As "God's in his heaven," some day we shall realize human emancipation "all over the earth," but it can only be when we are ready to acknowledge our sinful failures and to practice all four of our cardinal principles.

3. Is God Working in Russia?

Most Anglo-Saxon Christians find no difficulty in believing that God has been working in their own history. Many of them, however, look with aversion, if not with horror, on Soviet Russia, associated in their minds with communism, atheism, tyranny, and violence. If we are to understand contemporary history there is no country in the world so necessary for us to interpret correctly or so hard to comprehend as Russia, for our two systems are poles apart. In its sheer magnitude and might, Russia is challenging. In a sense, after World War II we had left not a big three, or four, or five nations, but a big two—the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. Realists see that the only possibility of lasting peace lies in understanding and co-operation between the Anglo-Saxon nations and Russia. And conversely, the chief menace of war probably lurks in the suspicion, fear and possible conflict between the leaders of the Russian socialist and the Anglo-Saxon capitalist systems. On the other hand, there is no valid reason why these two systems should not get along with each other as well in peace as in war. The world never has been united on one system, economic, political, or religious.

I would like to write of Soviet Russia as objectively and impartially as I can. Over a period of three decades, I tried to make a study of Russia on fifteen visits to that country—two to Czarist and thirteen to Soviet Russia. I held evangelistic meetings among the students in Czarist Russia in 1912 in Moscow, Petrograd, and Kiev, and debated with Soviet leaders on the subject of religion in 1926—I arguing for theism and they for atheism, I defending Christianity and they attacking it, before a mixed audience of communists and Christians.

For twenty years, each summer I took a party of educators, called the American Seminar, through Europe, usually visiting the principal countries from Britain to Russia. Before the imposition of wartime restrictions, alone or with others I traveled all over the U.S.S.R., often with friends like Maurice Hindus, sometimes without any official guide or interpreter, visiting industrial plants and farms, cities and villages, almost at will. I talked with workers and peasants, with religious and antireligious leaders, with representatives of the American press, friends of the old Czarist regime, and with Party members. After thirty years of study on repeated visits, I came growingly to this conviction: *Relative to our four principles of justice, brotherhood, liberty, and love expressed in loyalty to religion, as truly as the leaders of the Anglo-Saxon nations stand consistently for liberty and loyalty to religion, but fail in the matter of economic justice and racial brotherhood, so the leaders of Soviet Russia fail to give full liberty or to support vital religion, but they stand consistently for their own interpretation of what we call economic justice and racial brotherhood.*

Using a totally different vocabulary, the Russians of course do not talk about justice, brotherhood, love, morality, religion, or any other spiritual principles so dear to Anglo-Saxons—in the *abstract!* Instead they adopt a system that seeks to achieve immediate economic justice and racial brotherhood and which consistently tries to practice these. At one stroke, by a change from the private to the social ownership of the means of production, all workers by hand or brain are paid according to the quantity and quality of their labor and all feel that they are equally owners of all the wealth and industry and socialized agriculture of the Soviet Union.

The cleavage between Russian and ourselves did not begin with Lenin's revolution in 1917, but goes back more than a thousand years to the dark ages between the fifth and the eleventh centuries, when the ancient world became divided between Rome and Byzantium, and Christendom was rent in twain between the Latin and the Greek Churches (1378-1417). History has much to teach us as to our relations with Russia. This cleavage of centuries lies in part behind Soviet Russia's suspicion and dread of the Roman papacy and her conviction that Rome not only sympathized with and backed Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco, but at times helped to finance them. From Ur to Rome, and from the Renaissance and the Reformation to the present, we inherited Western civilization, while that of Russia has always been Eastern in its traditions.

This cleavage has been behind the centuries of strife between Slav and Teuton and between Russian and Pole. The Russians, while usually victorious, have been beaten at times and repeatedly invaded by the Mongols, the Turks, the Swedes, the Poles, the Japanese and the Germans. Russia has suffered repeated Teutonic invasions, the most recent being under Kaiser Wilhelm and under Hitler. Russians have inherited a deep distrust of their neighbors and the forces behind them, especially of a capitalism which seems jealous and fearful of their effort to build a new social order that seeks economic justice and brotherhood and to preserve their own security against further capitalist invasions. The Russians were driven to revolution in 1917 after four centuries of the regime of czarism, with its ignorance, oppression, and poverty. If we would remember that after our American revolution our own country was looked upon as dangerously radical by most Europeans, we might well apply a kind of political golden rule of tolerance in our judgment of Russia.

TWO SIDES OF THE SHIELD: THE RUSSIAN SIDE

In view of the gulf of suspicion that now separates the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R., it may help us to understand the Russian viewpoint if we look for a moment at their side of the shield, as they see it. Our object in this is not to justify all the actions of the Soviet Union, but simply to try to understand them. The October Revolution of 1917 was probably the most bloodless known in history, although it climaxed a whole century of revolt against one of the worst tyrannies of all time. Immediately it seemed to the Russians that all the forces of reaction within and without the Soviet Union gathered for the overthrow of the feeble, newly-formed government in what appeared to be a deliberate conspiracy. The Bolshevik seizure of power was the direct result of the inability of the weak and brief Kerensky Provisional Government, which lasted but a hundred and ninety-seven days, to either win or end the war begun and lost by the Czars.

Battle was waged both in public and secret by all the forces of anti-Bolshevism and the Allied and Associated Powers for the destruction of the new Soviet State.

The vast powers of counter revolution finally represented by seven White Russian armies were often aided and financed in London, Paris, Tokyo, Warsaw, and at times even in Washington. This united assault converted the quasi-coalition regime that had sought to unite all revolutionary elements into what finally became a compact, purged, one-party despotism fighting for its very existence against a world conspiracy. Soviet tolerance was driven to intolerance, an infant democracy was changed to dictatorship and evolutionary gradualism into "war communism."[14]

The Soviet Union under the statesmanlike leadership of Lenin—the greatest revolutionist of all times—had been able to meet the threefold demand of the war-weary, famished, and dispossessed Russian millions for *peace, bread,* and *land,* none of which the Kerensky regime could provide. On November 7, 1917, at the All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers and Soldiers Deputies, Lenin had said quietly: "We shall now proceed to construct the Socialist order." He said to Raymond Robins: "I have behind me the will of the mass of the peasants and workers. We are going to challenge the world with a producers' republic."

Under Stalin as Commissar for Nationalities, they sought to wipe out all racial, religious, national, and class animosities. Here was the largest country in the world attempting the boldest experiment in all history. They sought to build a new society in every department of life in the first total revolution ever attempted. There is no question about the early idealism that lay at the heart of that great experiment that climaxed a hundred years of revolutionary revolt against Czarism, any more than there is of the ideals of the American Revolution. The Soviets were able to provide a whole network of motives and incentives in place of the former profit motive. The first Constitution of 1918 voiced their aims as follows: "The abolition of exploitation of men by men, the entire abolition of the division of the people into classes, the suppression of exploiters, and the establishment of a socialist society."

---

[14] Frederick L. Schuman in *Soviet Politics,* 1946, records that "the Soviet Government between November and June, 1917-18, established itself and pursued its program with less violence and with far fewer victims than any other social revolutionary regime in human annals." At first bankers, manufacturers, engineers, and even landlords were asked to become salaried Soviet officials in order peaceably to "liquidate the bourgeoisie as a class." Only in March, 1918, did they adopt the name of the Russian Communist Party, decide to move the capitol to Moscow, and resolve that: "The Party must mercilessly suppress all attempts of the bourgeois to return to power. And this is what is meant by a dictatorship of the proletariat." Frederick L. Schuman, *Soviet Politics at Home and Abroad,* New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1946, pp. 129, 130.

Beyond Russia's borders, their aim was to make war impossible, to "transform the whole world into a co-operative commonwealth, and bring about real brotherhood and freedom." Soviet Russia, whatever its failures, abolished child labor and took the most advanced stand in the care of children. It stood for the equality of women in all walks of life; it abolished all unemployment during its three five-year plans, and eliminated the periodic business cycle of "boom and bust." It provided an elaborate system of social insurance; it went in for universal education and finally promoted the cultural and esthetic advance of the whole population. After a thousand years of despotic autocracy and tyranny, the Soviet Union took the boldest move ever known in history for economic justice and social planning. Although ruthless in its suppression of political enemies, it pioneered in its redemptive treatment of criminals. It stood passionately for the emancipation of the hitherto enslaved portion of its peasants and workers. All who have heard thousands of voices sing with deep religious fervor the "International" will never forget it:

> Arise ye prisoners of starvation!
> Arise, ye wretched of the earth!
> For justice thunders condemnation,
> A better world's in birth.

No more tradition's chain shall bind you.
Arise ye slaves! No more in thrall.
The world shall rise on new foundations.
You have been nought: You shall be all.

The Russian revolutionists were the first that had dared to dream: "The world shall rise on new foundations!" It was no wonder that when Lincoln Steffens was sent with William Bullitt to survey Soviet Russia for President Woodrow Wilson, he said: *"I have seen the future—and it works!"*

With their backs to the wall, when what seemed to them a world conspiracy of all reactionary and counter revolutionary forces had united against them, the Soviets fought terror with terror. The territory controlled by them dwindled to one sixteenth of Russia's total area, and, as at Valley Forge and in the American Revolution, over half their soldiers deserted at one time or another. Industrial production fell to a tenth of the Czarist maximum, and the starving Russians almost perished. Fighting for their lives, they were forced to abandon a policy of gradualism for "war communism," the immediate nationalization of all large-scale industry and later of almost all agriculture, as 25,000,000 small family plots were consolidated in 250,000 collective farms.

Even when Germany imposed the Peace of Brest-Litovsk which took away a third of Russian crop areas inhabited by 62,000,000 people, three quarters of her coal and iron and over half of her industrial plants, the Allied and American policy to the Soviets only moved to nonrecognition, fear, and rage. The reactionary American Ambassador, David R. Francis, pronounced the whole Russian experiment "disgusting." He repeatedly urged upon America the invasion of Russia; he assured the State Department in Washington that he would deport Lenin, and called upon the Russian people to overthrow the Soviet Government.[15]

---

[15] Raymond Robins and Bruce Lockhart of Britain saw the power and possibilities of the Soviet Government, but when Robins could get no assurance of help from our State Department, Lenin was obliged to accept the

When Lenin was fired upon and hit in the neck and shoulder by two bullets, the Soviet Union believed it had repeated and clear evidence that the reactionary forces within and without Russia had conspired to destroy their government. Woodrow Wilson, who had originally taken a generous attitude to the Russian Revolution, on July 2, 1918, finally yielded to Allied demands for intervention.[16] Fourteen foreign armies invaded the Soviet Union and seven principal White Russian armies were supported in the North, South, East, and West by foreign funds and munitions in the determined effort to crush out this first total revolution.[17]

The action of the White Armies and the White terrorists were, according to William Henry Chamberlain, "a veritable bacchanalia of drunkenness, corruption, and speculation." The foreign press was almost as efficient in its attack upon Soviet Russia as the hostile armies. Even the *New York Times* and *Current History* depicted Soviet Russia as "a mad house

---

humiliating and dangerous Brest-Litovsk "peace." Major, later Colonel, Raymond Robins had arrived in Russia in 1917 as Assistant Chief of the American Red Cross Division and, unofficially, in the service of the Intelligence Division of the United States Army, where his mission was to help keep Russia in the war against Germany. Secretary of State Lansing, who had been urging the support of the White Russian Kaledin's cause, recalled Robins to the United States. Robins had come with a note and proposition from Lenin for the support of the Allies, but Woodrow Wilson would not even see him. He was forced to defend himself before a Senate Committee investigating "Bolshevism" and "German Propaganda."

[16] See David R. Francis, *Russia From the American Embassy,* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921, pp. 269, 270; and Frederick L. Schuman, *American Policy Toward Russia Since 1917,* New York, International Publishers, 1929, pp. 340-341. The United States was to co-operate with Britain and France at Archangel, and it proposed a joint occupation with Japan in Siberia, while giving military assistance to the Czechoslovaks. In violation of its pledge to Washington to limit itself to 15,000, Tokyo alone poured in 73,400 troops to eastern Siberia. The only army which made a creditable record in Russia was that of General William S. Graves, as recorded in his *American Siberian Adventure,* New York, P. Smith, 1941. When by June 30, 1919, the last Americans in north Russia had been evacuated, our ill-fated intervention had cost us $3,000,000, 244 American dead, and 305 wounded.

[17] The foreign armies represented those of Great Britain, France, Japan, Germany, Italy, the United States, Czechoslovakia, Serbia, China, Finland, Greece, Poland, Rumania, and Turkey. Among George Stewart's *White Armies of Russia* were those of Yudenitch, Deniken, Kolchak, Karnilov, Kaledin, Wrangel and Semyonov. By these twenty-one armies, two and a half years of ceaseless counter revolution and invasion were carried on, while the civil war lasted for seven years.

ruled by homicidal maniacs," while they insisted that the "nationalization" of all women in Russia was proved by "photographs" and "eye-witness accounts." These gross misrepresentations were partly corrected by the later objective and sympathetic reports of Walter Duranty, but no papers were so effective as those of the McCormick, Patterson, and Hearst press which continued a barrage of venomous and shameless falsehood for three decades.

Intervention, civil war, and blockade were responsible for the death of some seven million Russian men, women, and children, and their material losses were later estimated by the Soviet Government at $60,000,000,000. For years the most effective individual enemy of the Soviet regime was Winston Churchill who estimated on September 15, 1919, that Great Britain had spent to date nearly $500,000,000 in the campaign against Russia, while France, Japan, and other countries had also spent large sums. The whole campaign was not only a military and political crusade against Bolshevism, but the economic stakes were high for Siberian gold, Russian timber, Donetz coal, and the oil of the Caucasus and of the Near East.[18]

The most notable American to identify himself with the anti-Soviet war was Herbert Hoover. He had been a successful entrepreneur and investor in eleven Russian oil companies and in many timber projects and had obtained valuable Czarist concessions. His companies filed claims for $282,000,000 damage when these and other Czarist properties were confiscated. At the Paris Peace Conference, he maintained that "Bolshevism is worse than war." Under Hoover, American food sustained the White armies in Russia, and

---

[18] The Czarist Empire had been a semi-colony of Anglo-French and German financial interests which had controlled 72 per cent of Russian coal, iron and steel, and 50 per cent of Russian oil. Some hundreds of millions in dividends, profits and interest, were drawn annually from Russian workers and peasants and poured in pounds and francs to foreign interests allied with the Czar. British and French investments in Czarist Russia were estimated at nearly $8,000,000,000. Michael Sayers and Albert Kahn, *The Great Conspiracy,* Boston, Little, Brown, 1946, pp. 100-106.

American relief became an effective weapon against the peoples' movements in Russia and Europe.[19]

Not until 1924 and 1925—after seven years of hostility—was the diplomatic and commercial boycott of Soviet Russia ended, as all the Great Powers, except the United States (which recognized the U.S.S.R. only in 1933), gave grudging recognition to the Soviet State as again a member of the family of nations. Lenin died January 21, 1924, thirteen days before Woodrow Wilson. Between the poverty-stricken year of 1924 and 1940, coal production of Russia had multiplied by ten, steel output by eighteen, engineering and metal industries by one hundred and fifty, national income by ten, industrial output by twenty-four, annual capital investment by fifty-seven.[20]

When on October 29, 1929, the Coolidge boom collapsed, within two years American stock losses totalled $50,000,000,000 and fifteen million American workers were finally left unemployed. In the same depression, with six million jobless in Germany, Hitler won six million votes in 1930 and 13,745,000 in 1932. The Soviet Union regarded fascism and nazism as the last stage of disintegrating capitalism. This had culminated in Hitler's counter revolution and was directed ultimately as a crusade against Russian communism. The Nazis' bid for world conquest was boldly proclaimed in Hitler's *Mein Kampf.*

In the face of the challenge of Hitler and the Axis for world conquest, eight times the Western Powers evaded their responsibilities, retreated, and even blessed the aggressors:

---

[19] *Ibid.,* pp. 106, 349. It is not denied that the American Relief Administration saved millions of lives in Russia in 1921. Mr. Hoover declared, however, to Oswald Garrison Villard on August 17, 1921: "The whole American policy during the liquidation of the Armistice was to contribute everything it could to prevent Europe from going Bolshevik." As Secretary of Commerce, as President, and subsequently, Mr. Hoover fought consistently for years to prevent the recognition of Russia and the establishment of friendly commercial and diplomatic relations between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. On August 13, 1931, when President, Mr. Hoover stated in an interview with the *San Francisco News:* "The ambition of my life is to stamp out Soviet Russia."

[20] F. L. Schuman, *Soviet Politics at Home and Abroad,* New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1946, p. 212.

(1) The Japanese seized Manchuria in September, 1931; (2) Hitler repudiated the disarmament clauses of Versailles on March 16, 1935, and began to arm Germany to the teeth for world conquest; (3) Italy invaded Ethiopia October 3, 1935; (4) Hitler remilitarized the Rhineland on March 7, 1936; (5) The Fascist attack on the Spanish Republic was led by Franco on July 18, 1936, aided by Hitler and Mussolini, while Washington, following the wishes of the Vatican and Downing Street, would not fulfill our treaty obligations and allow the Spanish Republic to buy American arms, and London and Paris supported Franco under the guise of "nonintervention"; (6) Japan invaded China in July, 1937, while the Tanaka memorial avowed: "In order to conquer the world, we must first conquer China"; (7) The Nazis seized Austria on March 12, 1938; (8) The Nazis demanded all the defensible barriers of Czechoslovakia, signed the Pact of Munich October 1, 1938, and then, breaking every pledge and promise, captured Prague and seized the whole of Czechoslovakia in their path to world conquest.

When Hitler's plan to rule the world became unmistakably evident, only the Soviet Union proposed an eight-power conference and an eight-power pact to stop Hitler, but the blind and reactionary Neville Chamberlain, who almost lost Britain her empire, repeatedly sought the appeasement of Hitler and was deeply hostile to Soviet Russia. When Franklin Roosevelt, alarmed at the Axis advance, proposed to "quarantine" the aggressors, Germany and Japan, in their trampling march to power, he was met by bitter criticism and hatred as a "war monger." The United States and appeasing Britain did not want to stop Hitler, but Russia alone at this stage challenged Hitler's advance toward world conquest.

When Hitler invaded the Soviet Union, Russia faced alone the full might of the greatest army the world had ever seen. The Russians retreated until they stood with their backs to the wall amid the ruins of Stalingrad and then hurled back the invaders and marched to Berlin in what General Douglas MacArthur called "the greatest military achievement of history."[21] In this brief statement, I have made no effort to point out the numerous mistakes that Russia has made, nor the evils America sees in the Soviet system. I have only tried to state Russia's case as she sees it.

As we review the past history of the two peoples of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. and find the causes of the deep suspicion that exists between them, we are not surprised at the Soviet Union's fear of encirclement and of the hostility of the capitalist nations. Russia never made war upon us, but fourteen of the western nations did invade the Soviet Union. In this crucial hour, we have atomic bombs—a vast stockpile of them—and, presumably, Russia has not.

The Soviet Union, judging by past experience, fears that United Nation supervision and management of nuclear energy is designed as the entering wedge by which "capitalist America and other conservative powers" would undermine the socialist economy and prevent the Soviet Union's production of atomic energy for the uses of peace. If Soviet engineers erected an atomically powered electric plant, such a power station could be forbidden on the ground that it was a formidable war potential. The Russians have been repeatedly warned by Lenin and Stalin that the capitalist world is hostile to them and that it will do everything in its power to invade or encircle them or cripple or destroy their system. We do not believe this is true, but the point is that they do believe it and with some reason.

The Russian counterproposal to the Baruch plan is itself an indication that they are willing to negotiate. In some respects, the Russian plan goes ever further than our own and the British believe the two plans could profitably be combined. We must remember that, in the light of her history, the one controlling principle of *security* has governed Russia's foreign policy for thirty years since 1917. In the light of her suffering at the hands of fourteen foreign nations, that will always be her imperative demand. We must realize the number of our people who have, however irresponsibly, proposed a preventive war while we can use our stockpile of bombs. As one example, George H. Earle, former Governor of Pennsylvania and Minister to Belgium, urged an ultimatum to the Soviet Union "to get back to her own territory, and if they refused I would use the atomic bomb on them while we have it and before they get it." That is one of literally more than a hundred such statements that have been reported to the Russians.

---

[21] Russia lost 50 per cent more men than all the rest of the European allies combined and destroyed twenty times as many Germans. The destruction and damage Russia sustained is estimated at the colossal sum of 679 billion rubles. Her industries are still crippled for years to come and her need for a loan is, of course, far greater than that of Britain. It is significant to her that Britain gets an enormous loan and she does not.

Some who want a preventive war while we have the monopoly of the atomic bomb are under the illusion that if we bombed and destroyed a dozen Russian cities, it would settle a possible war before it began. But the Russian armies could occupy and control practically the whole of continental Europe and neither America nor enfeebled Britain could dislodge them. We could not blow up the cities of Europe causing the death of millions merely because of the presence of Russian troops in these cities. The Soviet Union will soon have over thirty million young men of draft age and they can fight as they did in the last world war. In a word, in an atomic war, probably neither side could win, but both would lose, and wide areas would be in ruins. Let us now look at our side of the shield.

THE TWO SIDES OF THE SHIELD: THE AMERICAN SIDE

Many consider it to be an insoluble problem to know the real purposes of Russia and her motives. When the frank statements of their official leaders are consistently implemented by repeated action on Russia's military and diplomatic fronts, we cannot be blamed for concluding that these are their real purposes. Let us recall a few of these statements and the Soviet's actions in ever widening the sphere of influence which the Soviets now seek to dominate. In Stalin's official book, *Problems of Leninism,* currently revised and published in all civilized languages, he thus states the Soviet's foreign policy:

> It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialist states—ultimately one or the other must conquer.

In the latest 1939 edition of this book, in stating that the Russian Revolution was the first step in world revolution, Stalin says: "What is our country as it builds socialism but a base for the world revolution?" Again in the same volume, he says: "Dictatorship means unlimited power, resting on violence and not on law." In his speech on February 9, 1946, Stalin announced that "under a capitalist system of world economy," wars are unpreventable.

In the official *History of the Communist Party,* republished in Moscow in 1946, with a sale to date of some thirty million copies, or one for each literate family in the Soviet Union, the Communists state their view as practically infallible absolutists:

> The power of the Marxist-Leninist theory lies in the fact that it enables the Party to find the right orientation in any situation, to understand the inner connection of current events, to foresee their course, and to perceive not only how and in what direction they are developing in the present, but how and in what direction they are bound to develop in the future.

According to this official *History,* the Soviet Government was always sagacious, always far-sighted, always right, whether in making the pact with Hitler or anything else. Russian history has been conveniently rewritten to fit into the proper dialectic molds. No adequate credit is ever given President Roosevelt, or to the lend-lease of the Allies. Communist absolutists demand all or nothing. When Henry Wallace spent three fourths of his Madison Square Garden speech in 1946 in pleading for friendship and co-operation with Russia, the moment he implied that Russia had any responsibility for the present misunderstanding, or was not infallible in her policies, he was hissed or booed. Lenin wrote clearly of "smashing the bourgeois state apparatus" and said in his *Infantile Disease of Leftism in Communism:* "We must be ready for trickery, deceit, lawbreaking, withholding and concealing truth."

As stark realists, the Soviet leaders have felt for the last thirty years, ever since 1917, that they must sacrifice butter for guns and that they must do so during at least the next three Five Year Plans. Where we hoped for a genuine peace conference in Paris in 1946, the Soviets felt they must make it "The Battle of Paris" as an integral part of and continuation of World War II. We have been disillusioned at the fiction of intimate wartime unity among the Big Three, in learning that they never did form a genuine partnership.

Until 1944, when General Eisenhower's armies were inside Germany, the Russians always insisted on fighting their own war in their own way. They barred American and British military observers from all Russian fronts and refused to share with their Allies information about captured German weapons. For thirty years, Russia's rulers have been determined to play a lone hand. They never for one moment accepted Wendell Willkie's idealistic dream of "one world," but only an ever-widening sphere of influence that they could dominate on their own terms. We hoped first that they only sought security for the Soviet Union itself, then for the "friendly" border states as a buffer against invasion, but now they seem to seek to advance farther and farther into the whole of Europe, by diplomacy, by the presence of their enormous armies, and by the most ingenious tricks to force or foist their control on countries where they could not win voluntary support.

John Fisher, who served with United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in distributing relief in the

Ukraine, is one of a score of witnesses who concludes that "the Communist Party is probably the most efficient machine ever devised for the government of man."[22] This Party was formed as an underground conspiracy against the Czarist police and still is semi-conspiratorial. For a quarter of a century, its secret police, whether under the name of Cheka, OGPU, or NKVD, has been a privileged and powerful body. In this police state, it seems repeatedly to discover some new plot or menace to require its staying in power. It is their business to ferret out all heresy and to keep pressure on all economic leaders in industry and agriculture to increase production at the back-breaking pace called for by the present Five Year Plans.[23] This terrific pressure drives some industrial officials to run the risk of padding their statistics, which, when discovered, makes them victims of the fourth purge which is now in progress.

The controlled Russian press had to second the secret police in keeping on the pressure loyally to fulfill the goals of the plan. It had to assure the Russian people that they were the happiest on earth and that all but the most privileged few in America were in miserable unemployment and poverty. They were either Babbitts of luxury or wretched "Okies" as pictured by John Steinbeck. Russians were given no hint that the U.N.R.R.A. was pouring in $250,000,000 of food, clothing, and equipment, for that would reveal that Russia was dependent upon the capitalist countries and was poorer than they were. The invading Red Army soldiers were amazed to see that even in the most backward capitalist nations, like Rumania and Austria, everything was more luxurious than they had ever seen.

To review the extension of the Russian zone over the world, beginning with the Orient, under the Japanese threat, the Soviet Union naturally began to penetrate Outer Mongolia. They then sought to dominate Manchuria as the richest region of China. When we were supposed to need Soviet troops for the conquest of Japan to save American lives, Stalin demanded and received our recognition of Russia's "special position" in Manchuria as the price of the services of the Red Army. The Russians overran Manchuria and stripped it of invaluable industrial machinery when they grudgingly left it. They then obtained a Big Three agreement authorizing them to occupy northern Korea for five years, presumably long enough to incorporate it in their Communist sector and to prevent any unification of Korea as an independent country. They have thus far withheld effective backing of the powerful Communist forces in China, but there can be little doubt that they will throw their weight behind the Communists in the crisis in China.

---

[22] In his articles on Russia in the August, September, and October, 1946, *Harper's Magazine.*

[23] In John Fisher's region in the Ukraine, the average wage was 300 to 350 rubles a month which meant $30 to $35 a month in terms of American purchasing power. If men's shoes now cost the equivalent of from $80 to $160 and men's suits from $160 to $400, it means that all save the highest paid feel the pinch and pressure of the present system.

In Europe and the Middle East, Russia's policy of advance has been still more effective. Immediately after the surrender of Germany and Japan, when, according to General Marshall, American armies in Europe and Asia began to "disintegrate," the Russians strengthened their positions with powerful armies waiting for the "Battle of Paris" and a favorable settlement of the peace treaties. They won an entering wedge in the Near East as early as 1941, when the British agreed that the Red Army should occupy northern Iran. Getting the Russian troops finally out of Iran was only one long-delayed move on the chessboard, though they still powerfully overshadow Iran. There is already a deep Soviet penetration throughout the Middle East. Russia tried hard to get a foothold in North Africa and the eastern Mediterranean. She has asked for a return of a portion of Turkey that once was part of Czarist Russia. She has demanded the right to fortify with Turkey the strategic Dardanelles where Turkey could be kept permanently helpless before her.

The Soviets have backed the Russian-trained, hard-boiled Marshal Tito, knowing that he who holds the magnificent harbor of Trieste can bring irresistible economic pressure to bear on the central European states, especially Austria and Hungary. Tito went so far as to shoot down American fliers, and to hold American citizens in forced-labor camps, under slave labor conditions that were worse than war. Soviet Russia has been working to push its frontiers to Trieste by exploiting pan-Slavism among the Slavs and Communist antifascism among the Italian workers, for Communists have a toehold within each country. They apparently hope to enable Yugoslavia to fulfill all its aspirations and dominate Trieste within a few years.

When in Paris, on October 4, 1946, we sought to keep the Danube open to all nations, for "equality of opportunity," to the mind of Molotov it meant the hypocrisy of "dollar diplomacy" in order to make Rumanian, Yugoslavian, and Bulgarian industry and trade all the property of rich America which, Molotov claimed, sought always to dominate every peace conference. Russia has never allowed the four freedoms nor democratic elections in Poland, Rumania or Bulgaria.

Russia's occupation of Germany and Austria has been tragic for those countries and for any early hope of real peace in Europe. Russia was excessively suspicious during the war even while we were rendering her maximum aid by advancing some ten billion dollars in lend-lease. To allay her fears, Mr. Roosevelt made probably too generous concessions. We withdrew our armies to allow the Russians to occupy a wide zone completely surrounding Berlin. The Russians at once pulled up all double railroad tracks between Berlin and the American zone to make our occupation of Berlin as difficult as possible. They control the University of Berlin and impose rigid political tests upon the student body. They also control the schools in the American and all sectors of Germany through the domination of the Berlin Magistrate, and America has been unable to eliminate Communist textbooks even from our own sector. In Austria, the Russians claim 50 per cent of all Austrian industry and seem determined to impoverish and dominate the entire life of the country.

Our representatives find that the Russians "always appeal to the Potsdam accord when it serves their ends and violate it when it suits their purposes." Their officers travel freely in the American zone marking factory equipment for dismantlement and shipment to Russia, although they shroud their own zone in mystery and there is some evidence that they are setting up this equipment not in Russia but in Russian Germany. With millions of their troops spread throughout eastern Europe, they are engaged in a bitter press campaign—as they are in the Soviet Union itself—against the Western armies of occupation and the greedy capitalist nations. For Russian ends, Germany has been made "an economic shambles and morass of wholly unnecessary human misery."

Soviet policy uses political, ideological, and economic weapons in skilful co-ordination. Apparently Russia hopes to conquer the whole of Germany ideologically from the part she dominates by occupation. If she has a better chance of doing this by keeping Germany divided, she will do so, attributing the misery of the Germans to capitalistic exploitation. She has so long controlled the press and all sources of information in her own police state that she apparently has expected to do the same in all the zones she rules. She has created a forced merger of the Communist and Socialist parties in the Russian zone, and has used espionage, spies in organizations of every kind, justice by fiat, promises, threats and every form of pressure to win conformity to her Socialist Unity party. But in many of these moves, she has overreached herself, for *"Russian terror has made Communism odious in Germany and in Europe."*

In the western zones of Germany, in early elections Catholics, Protestants, and Socialists, often united in the Christian Democratic Union, have secured nearly 80 per cent of the votes and the Communists only about 10 per cent. Wherever Germans are in any measure free, Germany's rejection of Communism has been much more complete than it was in France. Here again American stupidities have sometimes aided the Communists. When in Bavaria, the Socialists and Christian Democrats united in asking for the provision of a planning commission in their new constitution, our military government ruled it out as incompatible with democracy. Then, amid the shambles of German cities in ashes, German conservatives wailed, "How do Americans expect us to rebuild these cities without planning?"

Russia seems to be willing to starve Germans almost to death to obtain her end of a Communist-dominated Germany. This in turn prevents the recovery of Holland and other countries in central Europe largely dependent upon Germany. Significant decisions of policy cannot be made through the United Nations since by the provision of the Russian veto, it does not have the power to prevent war, because all its functions presuppose a unanimity among the great powers, the lack of which is the very cause of the present crisis Thus America, Britain, and the United Nations stand relatively helpless before Russia's intransigent advance.

I do not wish to be guilty of sheer political illiteracy by equating Communism and Nazism. Communists were not, like the Nazis, guilty of the cynical and idolatrous worship of force and of a master race as ends in themselves. They hoped by one violent revolution to create a classless society and then so to get rid of force that the very government would "wither away." But Stalin's government has, of course, grown steadily stronger and has shown no tendency to wither away. If Russia's purposes must now be judged, not by the high ideals of her early and almost bloodless revolution, but by the ruthless statements of her leaders as interpreted by her actions in her steady advance from area to area, then we must make our position clear and unmistakable once for all. We did not mobilize fourteen million Americans and pay a price of 750,000 killed and three million wounded, and advance Russia ten billion dollars in lend-lease, to end the tyranny of Hitler merely to surrender supinely to another tyranny. Even though the two dictatorships may be poles apart in their ideals and the ultimate ends they seek, they seem to be similar at two points—in the ruthless means they use and the proximate end of getting all they can of Europe and Asia—of course without war.

When Reinhold Niebuhr returned from Germany after his bilingual investigation, interviewing Germans, Americans, and British, soldiers and civilians, all over Germany, his report in *Life* Magazine for October 15, 1946, represented not only his own penetrating analysis, but a composite photograph of the impression that the ruthless Russian advance has made upon almost all Americans and British, as well as upon German citizens in the American and British zones who have been compelled to face it and suffer from it. Niebuhr voices this joint conclusion as follows:

> Russian truculence cannot be mitigated by further concessions. *Russia hopes to conquer the whole of Europe* strategically and ideologically. . . . Her fears spring only partly from her sense of technical inferiority. They spring partly from the insecurity of the tyrannical oligarchy which rules Russia and which must, like all such tyrannies, sharpen the conflict of its nation with the world in order to make its oppression seem sufferable to its victims. . . . In the recent purges in the Ukraine, sixty per cent of Communist officials were removed from office. . . . A trip through Europe . . . has convinced me that the Russians are not, and will not be, satisfied with any system of eastern European defenses but *are seeking to extend their power over the whole of Europe.*

The Russians seem eager to sabotage any policy that does not mean turning Germany over to Communist control. The Russian occupation is apparently seeking to keep the parts of Germany outside the Russian zone in uncertainty, turmoil, and discontent until all other German parties and leaders have been discredited and the people in disillusionment and exhaustion turn to the Communists. Meantime the Potsdam policy has utterly broken down. The Russian army lives off the land while America is spending $320,000,000 a year in our zone and the British $200,000,000 in theirs.

Russia's main weapon is not the Communist army but the Communist idea that they alone know the secret of running the modern industrial machine without wrecking it every ten years. Marxist philosophy believes that it is not only absolutely right, but that it is bound to succeed and it is the only gospel for the world, and this is true even if they must starve and purge Russia and Germany and any other country that they conquer. The Marxist absolutist is crippled by his own mental rigidity. He thinks in formulas and talks in shibboleths. He alone holds the blueprint of future history. The appeal of Communism is essentially religious, although couched in materialistic terms. It calls for absolute devotion and utter sacrifice. By its convenient ethical code, anything that aids the revolution is right, even if it involves lying, treason, or murder. And anything that hinders the revolution is wrong, especially the system of the capitalistic countries. According to them, capitalism is not only fundamentally and necessarily unjust; it is a morally wicked and degenerate thing. In the paroxysms of its decline, in jealous rage it must invade the Soviet Union or call for a crusade to crush it. We rich Americans are the enemy and must be viewed as such. Because of our wealth and power and atomic bombs, we are considered potentially more dangerous than was Nazi Germany.

If Russia, though poor, is right, absolutely right, and we, though rich, are absolutely wrong, she may not want the fraternization of Russian and capitalist workers or peoples. Foreign workers would soon discover that the Soviet Union was not the workers' paradise that had been claimed, and

Russian workers would learn of the prosperity and high standard of life of Anglo-Saxon workers. Perhaps the Kremlin cannot afford "mutual understanding" between the peoples of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. This policy may hinder the early growth of democracy in the Soviet Union and in all the regions that they rule. Perhaps Russia does not want an understanding but would prefer to fish in the troubled waters of poverty and chaos in countries like Germany that have been stripped to the bone and made to feel that their whole future fate and hope of recovery depends ultimately upon the Soviet Union. Perhaps the Kremlin feels that it must maintain its dictatorship and tyranny for years to come rather than let the U.S.A. get a stranglehold on the U.S.S.R.

If I were in a responsible position, I would seek an overall understanding with Russia from Trieste to China, and seek to agree with our adversary "quickly in the way." I would let her know that we did not wish to monopolize the secret of the atomic bomb, much less to use it, but I would never gratuitously surrender the bomb and place ourselves in Russia's power until we were sure of adequate safeguards, and full inspection of all factories and laboratories developing atomic power, and no nation reserving the veto power at this point. I would not try with Britain to monopolize the oil of the Near and Middle East, and I would be as prepared to make as adequate a loan to Russia as we did to Britain when, and only when, Russia gives unmistakable proof of her friendship and co-operation. I would assure her all reasonable security, aid in her desperate efforts at recovery, and our firm friendship and co-operation if, and only if, she wishes to be a friend. If she stubbornly refused to come to any reasonable overall agreement, it would mean that Russia is an enemy and not a friend.

In Stalin's wise letter of 1946, answering the questionnaire of Alexander Werth, the British correspondent, he twice declared that peaceful collaboration and friendly competition between the Soviets and Western democracy was possible. He said that there was no "real danger of a new war," that the atom bomb was not a decisive military weapon, and that the foreign warmongers were a noisy but politically impotent minority. But there has been no sign that these fair words were followed by fair deeds by the Russian delegation in Paris or other conferences where the Soviet Union has pursued its objectives with undiminished truculence. No generous words of Woodrow Wilson in 1917 were of any avail to the new Russian Republic in view of the consistent actions of seven White Russian and fourteen foreign armies—including the American—as they made war upon the Soviet Union. In the same way, the words of Stalin's letter about peace and co-operation are of little avail if the consistent actions of the Soviet representatives in Manchuria, Korea, and China; in Iran, Turkey, Yugoslavia, the Middle East, and above all in Germany and in the continued "Battle of Paris" march relentlessly forward to carry out the fundamental purposes of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin, in Niebuhr's words "to conquer the whole of Europe strategically and ideologically."

Russian terror has for the time being cured the Germans of Communism but our stupidity may also cure them of attachment to democracy. The Russians will hold on to their part of Germany and try to increase economic misery in our part by holding us to the letter of the Potsdam agreement. We have made concession after concession in the interest of a settlement in Paris. We should have neither a "tough" nor a "soft" policy in dealing with the Soviet Union. We should encourage no wild talk or action looking toward war with Russia, but in our diplomacy *we should hold the line everywhere against this advance of Russia on all fronts*. Endless appeasement and continued concessions would have the same effect that they had upon Hitler in bringing on World War II. This is our side of the shield.

On October 19, 1946, the Federal Council of Churches announced their Plan for Peace with Russia. Maintaining that these two widely differing systems can with tolerance co-operate and keep the peace, they say in brief:

> War with Russia can be avoided and it must be avoided without compromise to basic convictions. . . . Communism as an economic program for social reconstruction has points of contact with the social message of Christianity, as in its avowed concern for the underprivileged and its insistence on racial equality. . . . A dynamic and fruitful peace can prevail in a world society where conflicts of faith are unavoidable: First the existence of conflicting beliefs must be considered as normal. . . . Second, all men must renounce the effort to spread abroad their way of life by methods of intolerance. . . . Third, the United States must accept primary responsibility to secure international acceptance of the method of tolerance. . . .
>
> It must be made clear that persistence internationally by the Soviet Government or the Soviet Communist Party in methods of intolerance, such as purge, coercion, deceitful infiltration, and false propaganda shielded by secrecy, will not in fact make their faith prevail and will jeopardize the peace. . . . Neither state socialism nor free enterprise provides a perfect economic system; each can learn from the experience of the other. . . . Each system fearing encirclement tends to encircle. . . .
>
> We have outlined a program containing four salient points: (1) The elimination internationally of methods of intolerance. (2) The elimination from the United States national policy of certain prejudices and practices which unnecessarily create tension. . . . (3) Co-operation of the American and Russian peoples at the scientific, economic, cultural and religious levels and co-operation of the United States Government with the Government of the Soviet Union in the curative and creative tasks envisaged for the United Nations. (4) Demonstration that democratic institutions which reflect Christian doctrine of the sacredness of the individual personality can be made so vigorous and life-giving that all peoples will want them.

If the second World War occurred twenty-five years after the first, the date of 1970, at the same interval of time after World War II, may be a critical period. Confirming the findings of the population experts who met at Princeton in 1945, the League of Nations experts recently estimated that the relative population of the European nations in 1970 would be as follows: The ten divided nations of Western and Central Europe[24] will have a combined population that has fallen from the present 234 to 225 million, while the U.S.S.R. alone will have a population that has risen from 174 in 1940 to 251 million in 1970. Even at that figure, it may not be stabilized. And added to this vast population are all Russia's border states that she insists shall have "friendly" governments. With the strongest land army of any nation in the world, unconquerable on her own soil or in Continental Europe, with the largest European population, increasing more rapidly than any other people in the world, with vast undeveloped resources and an open frontier such as America once had, the industrial and military potential of Russia is impressive.

GOOD AND EVIL IN RUSSIA

It is our thesis that the leaders of Russia have failed, from our point of view, and are likely to fail for a long time to come, in the matter of liberty and in their attitude to religion. Regarding liberty, it is our contention that neither Czarist nor Soviet Russia ever had full liberty in an Anglo-Saxon sense, nor even knew what it meant. Since the revolution of 1917, the Soviet Union has passed through three awful purges and even as we write is in the midst of a fourth purge. The first involved the elimination of the aristocracy and bourgeoisie who tried to overthrow the revolution; then came the kulaks or rich peasants who were "liquidated" because they opposed collectivization; and third the "Trotskyites and wreckers," or fifth columnists, who opposed Stalin were eliminated, including most of the old Bolsheviks who had followed Lenin in the revolution. According to the totals announced in their own press in *Pravda, Izvestia,* and forty local newspapers, the Soviet Government had found it necessary to shoot some 2,500 of their own leaders as "Trotskyites and wreckers" within two years.[25] One of the best informed and most objective Russians living today estimates that about half a million former leaders are gone, while Stalin glories in the training of half a million new proletarian leaders in government, in industry, in agriculture, in education, and in the army. The fourth purge may indicate that revolt is endemic under tyranny.

---

[24] The United Kingdom, Ireland, Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Hungary, the Netherlands, and Switzerland.

There has been a denial or severe abridgment of political and civil liberties in Russia. For long periods practically all foreigners have been under suspicion and few Russians have dared to associate with them. Few Russians are allowed to leave the country and even when abroad do not freely associate with foreigners. It is our belief, however, that some day the Soviets will really grant the liberty promised in their third Constitution and permit an open, honest opposition without shooting or oppressing their opponents. I was troubled by this denial of liberty on every one of my thirteen visits to the Soviet Union as I was on my two previous visits to Czarist Russia.[26]

I also found among Russian political leaders a harsh, dogmatic atheism, such that one who was not practically an atheist could not be a member of the Communist Party or the Leninist Youth Movement. Paul B. Anderson, in his excellent *People, Church, and State in Modern Russia,* 1944, shows how, after a period of real persecution, the Orthodox Church has recovered some of its liberties. The reading of the Article on religion in the first Constitution was changed from "freedom for religious and antireligious propaganda" to "freedom for the conduct of religious worship and freedom for antireligious propaganda is recognized for all citizens." (Article 124 in the 1936 Constitution).

---

[25] We must remember, however, that during the similar period in the French Revolution some 17,000 were executed, hundreds of thousands were imprisoned, others had been massacred, or had disappeared, while 150,000 were on the list of émigrés, liable to instant death if they returned to France.

[26] Anyone who wishes to realize what this lack of liberty under a dictatorship really means should read Mrs. Markoosha Fisher's *My Lives in Russia,* New York, Harper Brothers, 1944. He should also read Kravchenko's awful book *I Chose Freedom,* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946. While the former is by a friend and wellwisher determined to be fair, the latter is by an obvious enemy who recognizes no good whatever in Russia, despite what many regard as the necessary evil of its purges. Kravchenko will furnish valuable ammunition for all the enemies of Russia who think that World War III is necessary and desirable.

While the Constitution guarantees liberty of conscience and liberty of worship, by the law of April 8, 1929, no activity whatever is permissible for religious bodies save "conduct of worship" and private religious education in the home. The attitude of the Government to the Church has changed radically because the Church has altered its attitude to the State. On the very day of the German invasion of Russia, the Metropolitan, later Patriarch, Sergius, issued a call to all the parishes likening the conflict to the historic days when the Church blessed the Russian people for throwing back the Tartars, the Teutonic knights, the Swedes under Charles XII, and Napoleon. Recent visitors to Russia find that Church and State are for the present working loyally together.

The Government has established a council for religion which is cooperating with the religious bodies of all faiths. The Church has been permitted to open again theological seminaries for training candidates for the clergy. The principal Orthodox Church leaders have been provided with automobiles like Russian officials, and supplies needed for their work. Stalin has had the Atheist Society disbanded. Some army officers and college students now attend religious services. Stalin is surely not unmindful of the power of the Church which successfully resisted for years all the most intelligent and implacable efforts of the Communist Party, the Government, and the Atheist Society, to destroy it. According to Marxian theory, the State should have withered away and religion should have disappeared, but neither of these things has taken place and there is not the slightest indication that they will do so in any measurable time. New churches are being opened and there are now some fifty in

Moscow alone, some of which have never been closed even for a day since the 1917 revolution. According to the official 1941 government report, there are now 30,000 recognized religious societies or churches (compared to nearly 350,000 in the United States) with 58,442 priests and ministers officiating. The Orthodox, who are far the most numerous, have more than 100 bishoprics with 300 to 600 parishes in each. There are about a thousand each of Roman Catholic churches, Protestant churches, and Jewish synagogues. Yaroslavsky, the late head of the Russian Atheist League, complained to our party that after all their atheist propaganda two-thirds of the people in the villages were still Christians.

The Patriarch Nicolai maintains that the Russian Revolution has been a great blessing to the Church and has brought at least partial reformation and cleansing. He says: "The Church is no longer a tool in the hands of the autocratic state. . . . Under the Revolution the clergy returned to the true path which Christ has called them to follow—the path of serving the cause of the salvation of mankind." There may be, however, a new danger for true religion lurking in the present government favor. While the old Church was often reactionary and antisocial, it is possible that the new loyal and patriotic Church might be used as a tool by the Kremlin which is now the political head of about one hundred and fifty million Orthodox Christians.[27] Stalin now wields political and military power never dreamed of by any czar. Peter the Great was a provincial compared to him but he possessed a certain colossal barbaric power. Stalin now claims the whole inheritance of Peter's nationalism and Marx's and Lenin's internationalism.

Four currents converge to carry Stalin forward: a revival of Russian nationalism, nourished by resplendent victories over the Germans who had the greatest army the world ever saw; the flaming secular religion of the apocalyptic social reform of communism; a revival of pan-Slavism which might seek to rally every Slav around Mother Russia; and a revived and partially reformed Holy Eastern Orthodox Church. If Hitler could unite the double motivation of nationalism and socialism, much more legitimately may Stalin and his successors hope to do so.

---

[27] The Kremlin might be the possible self-appointed defender of 13,000,000 Orthodox worshipers in Rumania, 5,250,000 in Bulgaria, 6,500,000 in Greece, 7,500,000 in Yugoslavia, 4,000,000 in Poland and many others. This would be a possible lever, or instrument, or weapon, whether ecclesiastical or political, like that possessed by the Pope over larger numbers.

It may be objected that it is not justice, from our point of view, if the Soviets deny liberty to all enemies of the Government. The man who shot and killed Mayor Cermac of Chicago in trying to assassinate President Roosevelt was promptly tried and executed. We did not count it an injustice in this case to enforce our own laws even when they involved the death penalty. Similarly in Russia, if anyone tries to assassinate Stalin or to overthrow the Soviet regime, he is promptly tried and shot—whether there is one enemy involved or a million. That is Russia's own justification of her purges. What Russia understands by justice, however, is always an economic matter. It means to seek to end all unemployment, to provide jobs for all, the destruction of slums, the liquidation of poverty, and the end of monstrous inequality forever, where there shall never again be millionaires side by side with the ill-fed, ill-clad, ill-housed, and illiterate; where none shall have cake until all have bread. We have already seen what Russia means by democracy is the approximate equality of a classless society rather than our conception of liberty.

I visited Russia almost annually during the great depression after 1929, when the number of our own unemployed rose steadily from five, to ten, and finally to fifteen million, but there were never any unemployed in the Soviet Union during the world depression, and Russians are firmly convinced they will never have unemployment again—not so long as they have an intelligently planned economy. As a result of a planned economy, there is left not one rich man in Russia who has made a fortune for himself by exploiting the labor of others.[28]

This determination of Russia to give what *we* call justice, as *they* understand it, has many results. For one thing Russia has broken a world's record in education. When I was in Czarist Russia in 1912, only about a third of the people could read and write. Today nine-tenths of the population can read and write. Over forty millions are enrolled in their great system of public education that extends from the kindergarten through the university, and in addition a hundred million adults and children have been taught to read.

Again, the Soviet Union has broken a world's record in public health. All the doctors in Russia are paid by the Government to keep the whole population well. There is no charge to any citizen for doctors, medicines, nursing, or hospitalization, and all workers have two weeks' vacation on full pay in the rest homes of the old nobility. Nearly forty per cent of our twenty-two million citizens of draft age are unfit for military service, largely because of our neglect of public health. This is in glaring contrast to Russia's efficient system of public health which was so validated in World War II. The health, the virility, and the flaming spirit of patriotism of the whole Russian people during World War II vindicated the Soviet system—not of socialism or communism but so far as economic justice and racial brotherhood were concerned.

The fact that the workers feel that they are the social owners of practically everything in Russia, that there are jobs for all, and that all are protected by a complete system of social security has given a new dignity and sense of security to all loyal citizens. If a plebiscite were held and a secret ballot taken in Soviet Russia today, most authorities agree that over 90 per cent would vote for their present system rather than for a czarist or capitalist economy, and Stalin personally would get an even larger majority, far larger than Churchill or Roosevelt in their prime. With all its limitations, evils and errors, the Russian system today is a dictatorship on behalf of the proletariat which is gradually becoming more democratic with increasing security in the light of their liberal constitution of 1936.

---

[28] When the writer, Alexei Tolstoy, died recently, he left a fortune of half a million dollars, chiefly gained from royalties from his writings in many Russian languages, from over eleven million copies of his books sold during the war. This was many times the number of books sold by any American or British author and more than equal to a score of Anglo-Saxon best sellers combined. From the Russian point of view, Tolstoy was not a capitalist who had made his fortune out of the labor of others. He could have his automobile, his summer home in the country, special medical care, all the art objects and personal property he could afford, his bank account and government bonds, and he could leave a limited amount to his relatives or to various causes. Almost his only economic limitation was that he could not have the private ownership of the social means of production to exploit his fellow men.

I found a hundred million workers and citizens in Russia voting much more frequently than the workers of America do, and voting on matters that intimately concern them, regarding wages, hours, and conditions of work, and the choice of minor officials. They choose their own foremen, criticize them in public meetings and recall them when they are inefficient. There is also far more criticism of the whole economic process among Russian workers than in America. In the Soviet Union the workers feel that the industries are their own and that they are there to criticize and to increase production. Some things, however, are sacrosanct: The Soviet system as a whole, Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and members of the Polit Bureau are not criticized and cannot be. But almost every detail of bad management, of waste, or inefficiency can be condemned.[29]

---

[29] William L. White's *Report on the Russians,* New York, Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1945, so eagerly printed by the reactionary *Readers' Digest,* was deeply prejudiced and unfair at this point. For illustration, Mr. White suggests that one marked difference between the inmates of the Soviet Union and the Kansas state penitentiary is that if an inmate of the prison complained of his food, he would not be shot, while it is implied that the worker in Russia would be. One can hardly conceive of a more unfair statement. Mr. White's book was condemned as unfair by seventeen American newspaper correspondents who had seen service in Russia. Such sweeping condemnations by Max Eastman, William Bullitt, Eugene Lyons, David T. Dallin, or Victor Kravchenko are eagerly welcomed and utilized by all the enemies of Russia and by most of the American press. They are effective war propaganda.

The second value observed in Soviet Russia is that of what we call racial brotherhood. They have nearly all races represented in the U.S.S.R.: white and black, yellow and brown—182 races and ethnic groups in all. They speak 149 languages; while there are 30 principal nationalities. All are treated equally, however, both in principle and in practice. They have Negroes there, descendants of their former slaves in Asiatic Georgia. They are accorded equal dignity, equal pay, equal education, and every other kind of equality, economic, political, and social. There is not much intermarriage, for most races are happier when they marry among their own people, but the Russians would not be troubled in the least if they did intermarry. No Jim Crow restrictions nor discriminatory segregation would be permitted for a moment. If a priest or anyone else tried to stir up pogroms against the Jews again, or if any one tried to lynch a Negro, he would be promptly tried and shot. Russia uniformly stands on principle for "the equality and sovereignty" of all races, and she will back their right to ultimate independence all over the world as Thomas Jefferson would have done.

In 1926, when as a foreigner I challenged the Russians to a debate in Moscow on the subject of religion, every seat in the hall was sold within forty-eight hours and the proceeds were given to an orphange in charity. The debate lasted for five hours. Among some two hundred questions asked was one which in substance was as follows:

> You spoke of Christianity as the religion of love. Pardon us for speaking frankly, but we understand you lynch people in America, especially Negroes. We admit we are hardboiled in dealing with our enemies: "love your enemies" was never part of our system though it may be of yours. But just what is the connection between your ideal of Christian love and your treatment of Negroes by lynching and segregation?

When I crossed Asia on one of my last journeys preaching the Christian gospel of love to non-Christian students, Hindus and Mohammedans in India challenged me with a clipping from their daily press of America's last lynching. When I reached Japan, they had had time to procure the photograph of the terrible deed, and there on the front page of a daily with a larger circulation than the *New York Times* was the photograph of our burning a poor Negro at the stake before a howling mob, and Americans were held up to scorn before all Japan as the only people who descended to the moral degradation of lynching their own citizens.[30]

I do not wish to make an overstatement, but I say deliberately that if I thought that within fifty years, the Christians of America would make the same demand for economic justice and grant it in practice in the same measure that the Russians already have done, I would be amazed and deeply thankful. And if I thought that within fifty years, the Christians of America would get as far beyond race and color prejudice and beyond discriminatory segregation, in the full recognition of racial brotherhood, as the Russians already have, I should be proud of my country. But I have no such optimistic hope. Conversely, if I thought the Russians within fifty years would accept Anglo-Saxon standards of liberty and democracy, granting the four freedoms to an open honest opposition, and that Russian leaders would recognize the place and power of vital religion in the love of God and man, it would be an almost unbelievable advance. But if there is no early prospect of our realizing full economic justice and racial brotherhood in America, or of the Soviet leaders accepting the full implications of liberty and of the mighty possibilities of religion both individual and social, then I am compelled to conclude that God needs both peoples and that he will use what is good in each.

In a sense America and Russia have changed places in history. In 1776, in the American Revolution, this country led the van of advance on the left wing of radical revolution for the whole world. The new American Republic was a beacon light of hope to enslaved and oppressed peoples all over the world. Our Republic was an encouragement to the leaders of the French Revolution of 1789, in the periodic revolts in Europe like that of 1848, and to the Russian Revolution of 1917. The American Revolution demanded political independence from the tyranny of the England of George III. But once free, the property holders of the American Colonies drafted a conservative constitution[31] and developed the vast resources of a subcontinent until they became the richest nation on earth. The demand of the French Revolution was to share the privileges of the nobility and the church with the third estate of rising bourgeois capitalism. But in its very idea, the Russian upheaval was the first total revolution ever dreamed in history. Based on a clear philosophy, its avowed end was, not to establish privilege for a new class, but to create a classless society which should realize a whole new way of life—economic, political and social.

---

[30] Between 1900 and 1941 there were in the United States 4689 lynchings. In 1945 there was but one public lynching. All federal legislation against lynching or the punishment of lynchers has been blocked. Many communities have learned to put Negroes out of the way more quietly than before a howling mob; but lynching has not ceased in America.

The late Archbishop Temple saw clearly and said repeatedly that in this period of transition, we must welcome the undoubted values of both systems—of our free enterprise and Russia's social control, of our individualism and their collectivism, of our capitalism and their socialism. Dr. Temple believed that there were values in both systems and he was not afraid to say so. The Dean of Canterbury also holds that Soviet Russia is strong militarily because she is strong morally, and that she is strong morally because she has in such large measure realized the principle of economic justice implied in the social ownership of the social means of production. He holds that Russia has shown what can be done to outlaw race prejudice in a single generation. The Russians did not wait for peoples' minds to change. They made racial discrimination and persecution illegal and contemptible and thus formed enlightened public opinion.

---

[31] Charles A. Beard in *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the U. S.*, Macmillan, 1935, shows that five-sixths of the members of the Constitutional Convention were economic beneficiaries whose property interests were increased in value by the Constitution. Over half the people were unrepresented, including small farmers, mechanics, workers, slaves, indentured servants, women, and the propertyless poor who had no vote.

In conclusion we are not here arguing as between the merits of socialism and capitalism. Russia has one system and we the other. We are not trying to praise Russia but only to understand her. We are only contending that if all four principles are essential for all men, it is possible and even probable that God is compelled to use Soviet Russia in the matter of economic justice and brotherhood, just as he used the pagan idolater Cyrus, King of Persia, when the chosen people of Israel had failed him. We therefore conclude that God is indeed working and working effectively in Soviet Russia today. Perhaps these are among the signs of the times and the meanings of this era that the followers of Christ are called to understand.

The belief that despite all the evils in their system, God can and will use Soviet Russia in the matter of economic justice and racial brotherhood is not only a theory but is borne out in practice in Czechoslovakia. This seems the brightest spot in continental Europe. Here is one country forced to make a synthesis between the Russian and Anglo-Saxon systems, between their ideal of economic justice and ours of liberty. Dr. Benes, the President, had been betrayed by Chamberlain and Daladier and forced to surrender his whole country to Hitler. Because of geographical necessity, he preferred a twenty-year treaty with the Soviet Union than one with Britain and France. He quietly stated to Russian leaders his personal declaration of independence, or rather of interdependence. He as President is a Socialist; the Prime Minister is a Communist. In a coalition government, all parties seem to be working for the real welfare of Czechoslovakia.

President Benes does not want to see his country dominated by the "free enterprise" of American capitalism nor by the tyranny of a police state. With his great predecessor, President Masaryk, he has inherited the tradition of Anglo-Saxon liberty, together with Socialism's passion for justice. If the Russians tried to impose the same ruthless tyranny they have attempted in their section of Germany, the Czechoslovaks would fight for their freedom. There is no "iron curtain" in their country. Czechs and foreigners speak with a large measure of freedom. They are perhaps blazing a new trail in the determined effort to unite the best elements of the two systems for the welfare of their country.

CHAPTER VI

THE MEANING OF THE PRESENT WORLD SITUATION

BEFORE WE CAN UNDERSTAND the significance of present conditions in Russia, Britain, America, and other countries we must make an effort to comprehend the meaning of the world situation as a whole. I believe that *the present crisis is characterized by four major factors: It is a period of world revolution; it is polarized by tension between the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R.; it is marked by the crisis in capitalism and the disintegration of bourgeois society; and the world is suddenly forced to enter the new atomic age, either of titanic destruction or of creative construction.*

WORLD REVOLUTION

We are now in the midst of a period not only of global wars but of *world revolution.* This is affecting not only war-torn Europe but ever widening areas inhabited by long backward or conquered peoples whom we had supposed were contented under the shadow of benevolent imperialisms. The ferment now extending over nearly all of Europe and Asia will undoubtedly soon spread over Africa and the entire two-thirds of the world inhabited by colored peoples. Europe, Asia, Africa, Australasia, and the Americas—although they do not realize it as yet—are now being drawn into a single revolutionary vortex. We have been passing through two awful cataclysms and their tragic aftermaths, World Wars I and II, and we are now menaced by the imminent threat of

World War III. Two global wars within a generation have forced upon us the fact that we have *one world* with which we must deal as a whole, but we have not yet achieved any world organization or government that can control that anarchic world, militarily or politically.

TENSION BETWEEN THE U.S. AND THE U.S.S.R.

The present crisis is in a transitional period of tension and strife when *the world is polarized between two powers and two systems: the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R., capitalism and socialism, individualism and collectivism, a free and a planned economy.* There is tension between the basic demands for liberty on the one hand, and for justice on the other; between a people who have championed liberty ever since the Magna Carta and who believe in the four freedoms, and a people whose passionate demand has been for an economy of justice in a "continuing revolution" for the brotherhood of a classless society. As we have seen we are at present in a period of suspicion and growing tension where there has been a steady deterioration in the relation of the great powers ever since the failure of the first London Conference. Each country deeply desires peace for the prosperity of its own economic system, and each abhors war and desires to be let alone to follow its own convictions. Yet the great powers clash in every danger zone, whether in Germany or Japan, in the Balkans, in the Near East in Iran and Palestine, or in China. Each desires one world but with its own ideology. Although both deplore it, two blocs are steadily building up a balance of power against the dreaded contingency of another global war. The one is forming around the pole of the Soviet Union and the other around the Anglo-Saxon nations, just as two blocs and two poles were forming before World Wars I and II.

In a very strange way, that discerning prophet of democracy, Alexis de Tocqueville, in his *Democracy in America,* written 110 years ago, foresaw the power of these two nations, though naturally he did not do full justice to the present Soviet Union in his description of Czarist Russia's tyranny and servitude. At the close of his first volume on *Democracy in America* he writes:

> There are at the present time two great nations in the world . . . proceeding with ease and celerity along a path to which no limit can be perceived . . . the Russians and the Americans. . . . The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends . . . the Russian centers all authority of society in a single arm (the principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter, servitude). Their starting point is different and their courses are not the same; yet *each of them seems marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe.*

The capitalist countries have had little realization of Russia's desperate straits. It is her conviction based on much evidence, that the rest of the world is against her, as she is fighting alone for what seems to her a great principle. Joseph Stalin still feels as when he spoke in February, 1931:

> It is sometimes asked whether it is not possible to slow down the tempo a bit, to put a check on the movement. No, comrades, it is not possible. To slacken the tempo would mean falling behind. And those who fall behind get beaten. One feature of the history of old Russia was the continued beatings she suffered for falling behind. That is why Lenin said during the October revolution: "Either perish, or overtake and outstrip the advanced capitalist countries." We are fifty or a hundred years behind the advanced countries. We must make good this distance in ten years. Either we do it, or they crush us.

Close observers of the situation in Europe[1] see that battle-lines are forming there somewhat differently than those between the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. While the United States emerged on the peak of a war boom as the one rich capitalist nation left on earth, Europe was left in abysmal poverty with millions on the verge of starvation. The old capitalist bourgeois Europe was dead. The debris of the bombed cities of London, Berlin, Warsaw, and Le Havre are symbols of the disappearance of an old social order. Into this chaos came the Communists all over Europe as the one organized party with clear fixed goals, pointing proudly to Russia as the shining example of their system. But millions who witnessed the occupation of the Russian soldiers, or who saw the effects of Russian tyranny, or who observed the Soviets' reshaping of the "friendly" border states on the eastern side of the "iron curtain" have lined up against them. They are seeking a social order that will protect them against both nationalist state tyranny and Moscow control.

---

[1] Such as Paul Hutchinson, Managing Editor of *The Christian Century* in his series of articles in *Life* Magazine, beginning September 23, 1946, and those by Reinhold Niebuhr in *Life* and *The Nation,* which agree in their diagnosis of the European situation.

The old-line social democrats see in some countries a supreme opportunity, but they are handicapped by their past record in the Weimar Republic. At present the chief alignment seems to be between the Russian-inspired Communist parties and those standing for an evolutionary socialism based on Christian principles. Whatever its dangers, recent elections may indicate that the coming alignment may be between the Christians and Communists. Wherever there has been any semblance of free elections—in France, Italy, Norway, Hungary, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Holland and Germany—similar patterns have shown social-democratic parties losing ground or barely holding their own, with rapidly growing Communist parties and new "Christian" parties topping the polls or capturing parliaments. Already presidents or prime ministers have emerged from religious parties in France, Italy, Hungary, Austria, and Holland. The Catholic party holds most of the seats in the Belgian parliament, while in Germany, the Christian democratic Union is the top party in the American, British, and French zones. Frequent campaign slogans are "Vote Communist!" or "Vote Christian!"

Remarkable to an American is the fact that *the Christian parties, whether Catholic or Protestant, proceeding along socialist lines, favor the nationalization of utilities and com-*

munications, of most heavy industry, civil aviation, banking and insurance. They seek to preserve individual liberty and to exploit or socialize the whole resources of the community to insure social justice. They are in fact seeking all our four cardinal principles. They feel that the Beveridge plan and the American New Deal do not go nearly far enough to meet present conditions in Europe. They are driven to a socialized planned economy convinced that only some form of socialism can hope to rule Europe. The one exception is Holland where the Anti-revolutionary party of the ultra-fundamentalist Reformed Church and the Christian Historical party are still conservative and would have liked to keep Holland's hold upon the Dutch Indies. They make, however, little or no appeal to youth or ex-servicemen who see that the old order is dead, and they lost ground in the last election. The more socially minded Catholic party won the top position with thirty-two seats in parliament while the Communists won forty per cent of the votes in some of the big cities. Of the church parties in Europe, five are Catholic in source and leadership, three are Protestant, two are products of Catholic and Protestant collaboration, and some have profitably joined forces with the Social Democrats. Catholic parties are powerful in France, Italy, Austria, and Czechoslovakia. In Norway the new Christian People's party is chiefly Protestant and won ten seats in Parliament in its first election. The new Premier of conservative, Protestant Holland is a liberal Catholic, while a republican Protestant pastor is President of conservative Catholic Hungary.

The Pope, who is one of the most astute politicians in Europe, who has roamed over the United States and the world and is at home in nine languages, has been giving powerful encouragement to lay Catholics to launch church political parties. On the eve of recent elections in France and Italy, he appealed to the faithful to choose between "the champions and the wreckers of Christian civilization." He declared that the issue in Europe "will continue to rest on the firm rock of Christianity, on the acknowledgment of a personal God, on belief in the spiritual dignity and the eternal destiny of man," on whether the people of Europe "will choose to entrust their lot for the future to the unfeeling omnipotence of a materialistic state without any ideals that stretch out beyond this world, without religion and without God." The day after his speech, the Catholic party in France won the top position as Communists and Socialists lost ground, while the Catholic party in Italy polled over eight million votes—almost double those of either the Communists or Socialists.

It need not be pointed out to any genuine liberal that there is danger in this alignment between Communist and Christian. If we must hold inexorably before us our four interrelated cardinal ideals, can we be much more enthusiastic over a crusade against Communism led by the Pope for his totalitarian Church than for the one led by Hitler for his totalitarian State? The papacy, which entered into concordats with Mussolini, which backed Franco as the ideal son of the Church, which has never shown a fraction of Russia's passionate demand for economic justice in any of the feudal states dominated by the Catholic Church, and which does no believe in liberty in an Anglo-Saxon sense, is certainly in no position to lead a holy war against the Soviet Union. And even if it could do so, it would lead to the same result as Hitler's counter-revolution. Genuine liberals in Europe believe that the European crisis is basically spiritual and that the political, social, and economic future depends on the triumph of genuine faith. They are almost equally afraid of Russian or papal totalitarianism and of American capitalistic economic imperialism. Rather than follow any of these they demand the fulfillment of all our four cardinal principles. They would far rather follow the example of Great Britain in her "revolution by consent" in the gradual nationalization and socialization of a planned economy, than America's unplanned and unplanning "free enterprise" which they believe is headed for a great depression that will have grave consequences for all countries that depend upon the United States.

CRISIS IN CAPITALISM

The present crisis in capitalism is marked by *the widespread disintegration of bourgeois society in many lands.* As former times saw the fall of slavery, and the rise and fall of feudalism, we have now witnessed the rise, the triumph, and the supreme crisis of a capitalist economy and its bourgeois society. We are now in the midst of the disintegration of that society which is affecting the economic, political, educational, esthetic, moral, and spiritual life of all industrialized nations. As at the close of every epoch, there are now signs both of the disintegration of an old order and the beginning of the reintegration of a new one. Russia is the type of a nation suddenly transformed through a violent total revolution, now trying feverishly to construct a whole new social order. Great Britain is the type of a nation that is making the transition to a new order through a "revolution by consent," by a constitutional, parliamentary, educational, evolutionary process of gradual transformation. The United States, as the strongest and richest capitalist nation, is the type of country that is resisting this tide in the affairs of men, which, against her will, is moving her and the whole world toward a socialized planned economy.[2] As we have seen previously, the world has been passing through certain successive economic stages of slavery, feudalism, and capitalism, as each has risen, reached its climax, and then disintegrated. The whole world seems now to be moving toward a socialized planned economy, whether the ideology of a given country is socialist, communist, or capitalist. The United States will never willingly follow the Russian system but must preserve her dearly-bought liberties, her high tradition of democracy, and above all, vital religion, as the very heart of such an economy.

---

[2] Probably the best philosophic statement yet made regarding the present world situation and the disintegration of capitalist society is by Professor Paul Tillich in *The Christian Answer,* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1945, pp. 1-44. I am here indebted to this statement.

The rise and fall of capitalism has passed through three phases. The first was the period of bourgeois revolutions in America, France, and other countries in Europe, when the new order was struggling to establish itself above the crumbling foundations of a disintegrating feudal society and when it was the most hopeful thing in the world. The second was the phase of victorious capitalism, through the creation of a world mechanism of production and exchange in an expanding economy over vast empires in Europe, Asia and Africa. The whole world seemed materially to progress during the nineteenth century. There was growing prosperity—especially for the Anglo-Saxons—in Britain's political and America's economic empires, in the economic exploitation of whole continents. There was a rising standard of living, the spread of education and of political democracy which became the effective tool of economic capitalism. But as we have seen, even Anglo-Saxons never succeeded in giving justice to all, or recognizing the equal brotherhood of all, especially of colored peoples and poor whites. The very provision of wealth and power and privilege for the owners of the means of production, without affording security and the good life for the masses, loosed vast destructive forces such as periodic depressions, with widespread unemployment, epidemics of strikes by dissatisfied labor, and an impoverished life for the poorer classes and for the have-not nations.

The cumulative force of these evils brought on the present crisis in civilization. *The inevitable rise of fascism, nazism, and communism—all in revolt against capitalism—were but symptoms of the desperate sickness of our acquisitive society, and the disintegration and transformation of our capitalist order became the dynamic center of the present world situation.* The press and literature of the three periods show the almost equal blindness of slave owners and feudal lords in their day, and of the present owners of the means of production to the meaning of the transformation taking place before their very eyes. The same fear and horror with which the feudal lords viewed the rise of a "vulgar" bourgeois capitalism, is now observable in capitalist owners, as they see the rise of socialism over much of the rest of the world.

The almost universal dissatisfaction with our present system of education is characteristic also of the failure of other areas of our social order. "But education without a determining center is impossible." And much of our education, together with other aspects of our life, has lost that center. We have left God out of our materialistic civilization. The disintegration of our economic order is evident to almost all save the owners of the means of production, and those dependent upon them.[3] Economic crises have become more frequent, widespread, and fatal. Intolerable insecurity and periods of chronic unemployment, occurring almost every decade, have brought misery and despair for whole sections of our population. As in the days of Alexander Hamilton, big business seeks state aid for the winning of a war or for the "socialization of their losses," yet with deep hostility it indignantly resents any effort to provide full employment and security for the workers, or to forestall the recurrence of the chronic crises and depressions. Everything must be done under the slogan and shibboleth of "free enterprise," even though it is free only for the owners.

We must now sail amidst storms between our economic Scylla and Charybdis, between the anarchy of free enterprise, and the tyranny of the almost complete mechanization and dehumanization of mass-man under a socialist dictatorship. We look with abhorrence both upon injustice in America, and upon the tyranny in Russia. We must demand nothing less than both liberty and justice for all, and steadily keep before us all four of our interrelated goals. We must preserve our priceless heritage of true democracy, both as a constitutional procedure and as a way of life. The nineteenth century was the "great century" of material prosperity and of expanding capitalism and imperialism which financed all the arts, charities, and missions. The twentieth century is, as yet, the tragic century, until we solve our inescapable problems of fierce industrial strife and international global war. This century has witnessed the breakdown of the nineteenth century's mechanistic naturalism, in history, psychology, biology, nuclear physics, and even of the old mathematics. The present crisis challenges the foundations of all knowledge, its interrelations, and its meaning for life. We have gained knowledge but not wisdom. We are entering a new age of incalculable power when we have hardly emerged from the stone age in our human relations. We have made the world materially a neighborhood, before we have grasped the meaning of spiritual brotherhood.

---

[3] A few leaders like Paul G. Hoffman, President of the Studebaker Corporation, Eric Johnson and others see the challenge to capitalism and urge us to put our house in order.

THE NEW ATOMIC AGE

The present world crisis is at the dawn of the atomic age. If God is not in history working effectively in the plentitude of his power, we may destroy our planet or wreck our civilization. The seemingly simple Einstein Equation[4] shows the vast power that is at our disposal either to use or to abuse. If this is God's world, God himself cannot be lacking in power if every atom of the universe is a microcosm of inconceivable energy. One reason that the League of Nations failed was that there was lacking the will to make it work.

---

[4] E equals mc^2—with E standing for the energy expressed in ergs, m the mass in grams, and c the speed of light in centimeters per second. Matter on the earth and elsewhere seems to be merely frozen energy, or stabilized force. Professor John Archibald Wheeler of Princeton believes that the most powerful nuclear transformation yet known, the fission of a heavy nucleus, releases only one 1000th of the energy locked up in the mass. Professor Wheeler believes that we may yet learn the ultimate secret of how totally to transform matter into energy.

It was not the machinery of the League, defective as that was, but the nations that composed it, that failed. The same lack would cause the new United Nations Organization or any ideal paper constitution of a federally organized world to fail. Only if atomic energy is used, not as a weapon of death but as the instrument for a future of abundance for mankind based on sound economic and spiritual principles, will it mark a new era.

This period of world revolution more dynamic, perhaps, than the vast changes brought about by the scientific discoveries of Copernicus and Kepler and, later, by the applied science of James Watt. We cannot meet the crisis with the outworn philosophies that were suited to the economy of slavery, or feudalism, or of bourgeois capitalism, despite the triumphs that the latter achieved in the three centuries after 1600. All these three economies were built upon the wealth and welfare of the few, at the expense of the exploitation of the many. The slaveholder, the feudal lord, and the capitalist owner of the means of production, all believed, in their wishful thinking, and assured the masses, that the poor were better off than they could be under any other system. Nazism was the culmination of a society built upon the anarchy of free enterprise. If we are really entering a new atomic age, we shall have to have a philosophy adequate to it. We agree here with Harold Lasky that "we must plan or perish." Even amid the stress and storm of the War Between the States, Lincoln saw the need of a new philosophy when he said: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficult, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

Einstein does not believe that the bomb has created a new problem;[5] it has but accentuated the old problem of sovereign nations, each a law unto itself, which he believes makes war inevitable. He does not believe that civilization will be wiped out in a war fought with the atomic bomb, though "perhaps two-thirds of the people of the earth might be killed." In the ancient myth Prometheus brought fire down from heaven and started primitive man on his long pilgrimage in the way of science and the arts. Will the atomic power now in human hands surpass the moral strength of man to control it?

---

[5] Einstein on the Atomic Bomb, as told by Raymond Swing in the *Atlantic Monthly*, November, 1945.

The controlled release of atomic energy is the most revolutionary achievement in the history of science. True science is never, as in Hitler's view, a racial or national achievement; it is an international activity. As the bomb was an international discovery, it should be an internationally safeguarded trust. We all recall how half a century ago, the German physicist and nobel[6] prize winner, William Röntgen, discovered röntgen or X-rays. Then the Frenchman Henry Becquerel, noticed the effect of uranium ore on a photographic plate. The Polish-born Marie Curie, and her husband, after years of patient experiment, caught a glimpse of the radium atom inside a spontaneously disintegrating world. J. J. Thomson of England, and Ernest Rutherford of New Zealand, gave us the electron and the proton. Erwin Schröedinger, an Austrian, George Hevesy, a Hungarian, Peter Kapitza, and D. Skobelzyn of Russia, Raman of India, several Japanese scientists, and Carl D. Anderson, son of a Swedish immigrant, added to our knowledge of nuclear physics. Three of the greatest contributors were refugees, fleeing from Hitler and Mussolini: the Germans, Einstein and Lise Meitner, and the Italian, Enrico Fermi.[7] On August 6, 1945, the bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima helped to hasten the end of World War II, and it marked the birthday of the new age of atomic energy.[8]

---

[6] Alfred Bernhard Nobel (1833-96), the Swedish scientist, was educated in Russia, studied engineering in America, lived in France and England, and died in Italy. His aim was to "produce a substance or a machine of such frightful efficacy for wholesale devastation that it would make wars altogether impossible." Out of nitroglycerin he made the "safety powder," dynamite. On his death he left a fund to be distributed in prizes "without regard to nationality . . . to the worthiest" in the fields of science, literature, and the cause of peace. The theories were usually worked out in the Old World and experimentally confirmed in the New. A large number of Nobel prize winners were Jews forced into the ranks of science by their exclusion from other fields, and often driven to America by Hitler's persecution. God, always in history, sometimes makes the wrath of man to praise him, even in anti-semitism.

The present crisis in history is caused both by our advance in technics, of which the control of atomic energy is the symbol, and by the disintegration of our economic order. There are two dimensions of the crisis which are both important. One is the philosophical-religious weakness in the very heart of our culture; the other is the political-social maladjustments in the body of our material civilization. One is spiritual; the other material. Both are important, for there are maladjustments on both levels of our existence. Both were evident in the defeat and temporary degradation of France, both were obvious in the fall of Germany and Japan, both are evident in each of the Big Three at present. The political instruments constructed at the San Francisco Conference amid suspicion and tension were but meager, and of minimal efficacy, because of the lack of imagination, of mutual trust, and of moral cohesion. Each major power was more interested in its own system of unilateral security in the event of another war than in the security of all against conflict. The safety which each seeks by itself, or in its own bloc, may easily vitiate the power of the mutual system.

---

[7] Fermi, in 1939, saw in the neutron, discovered by the Englishman, Chadwick, the key to the release of almost limitless energy by the splitting or fission of the uranium atom. Chain reactions were discovered by Hahn in Berlin. Only Lise Meitner, however, correctly interpreted these chain reactions and escaped from Germany to place the information in the hands of Niels Bohr, a Dane. In February, 1939, Fermi exploded a microscopic quantity of pure uranium—235, and then scientists all over the world began feverish experiments, including Hitler's Aryan scientists. Not the wooden military mind, but a small group consisting mostly of foreign-born scientists in America, developed the release of atomic power. President Roosevelt, after reading a letter from Einstein, took the bold action that was necessary actually to develop the bomb.

[8] In General Marshall's final report on the war, he showed that 93,000,000 men and women, Allied and Axis, took part in the world's greatest war. At the peak of strength, there were 22,000,000 Russians, 14,000,000 Americans, 12,000,000 from the British Empire, and 6,000,000 Chinese. Japan had listed 44 cities destroyed, 260,000 killed, 412,000 injured, and 9,200,000 homeless. The two atomic bombs had killed 90,000, wounded 180,000 and cost $2,000,000,000. Although the United States had 750,000 killed and three million wounded, Britain's losses were proportionately three times our own, while the losses of Russia were, of course, far greater still.

The gigantic problems of building one genuine world-community out of the anarchy of suspicious sovereign nationalisms seems to be beyond the feeble human powers of our generation. We have now the power of destruction to wreck our world, but not to unite and save it, unless we recognize God's place in history and the imperative necessity of our four principles, beginning with justice as the first fundamental. Our world is precariously held together in economic interdependence created by modern technics, but it is now threatened with military destruction by these very technics. The fear of global atomic war is not half as potent as the fear of any concrete foe such as Russia; and her fear of us is far greater than our fear of her. Each is strong in fear and weak in faith; each has implicit confidence in its own system and its own worthy motives, and little trust in those of the other. The family and the nation as the slow growths of centuries, are bound together in strong cohesion. The international community, on the other hand, seems as feeble as a tottering child learning to walk. It lacks a single center of power and authority; there is no common language, or cultural, moral, or religious tradition, no sense of a common history, but only the memory of international friction, competition, and wars. Technics in modern communications have created a potential world community, but technics in production have shattered the old world. The modern industrial machine has become a frankenstein which has divorced the skill of the worker from his tool, and made the individual worker powerless except as he organizes.

In the light of the relations between Russia and America in the postwar world, there are three tasks before us. First is the work of pacification, in agreeing upon treaties and in the establishment of lawful and effective governments in all areas of the world, especially in Germany and Japan.

Second, the United Nations must be gradually built up, avoiding the pitfalls that proved fatal to the League of Nations. The smaller nations will have to be patient at first, in view of Russia's insistence upon her power of veto. No impossible burdens should be placed upon the infant United Nations at the beginning. It could not, in its infancy, settle the dispute over the territory of Turkey, or the oil of Iran, where Russia is one part in the controversy, without running the risk of disrupting the organization. The peace-keeping function of the United Nations must see that the unsettled regions of the world, especially the rich oil regions of the Middle East, do not become areas of mortal conflict among the great powers. The United Nations must be built up in its own structures, with an infinite variety of transnational co-operation which makes for well being, culture, and peace in Europe, Asia, and the Americas.

Third, we must proceed very slowly toward the formation of a world state. We cannot at once organize a world legislature and executive, for our own government would be the first to boycott and block it, as it did the League. We must slowly build up a supranational regime of law, under which individual persons will gradually acquire rights and duties. As we approach this task, we must recognize that the two chief problems of the world, so far as a world federation and government are concerned, are the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. All mankind must be gradually habituated to a regime of world law until no member—not even the U. S. A. or the U. S. S. R.—will say "I am not of the body, but a law unto myself," in proud, irresponsible national sovereignty. Long before we realize a world legislature, a body of international law can be built up by treaties, conventions and courts, national and international. Long before there is a world government elected by all the peoples of the earth, the world state can and will gradually grow into being. Thus pacification, the United Nations, and the world state of law to which all individuals—including the rulers of national states—are subject, are the three necessary stages to reach our goal of peace. It is obvious that if the great goals of history are to be attained in one world, we cannot leave God out of his world nor disregard or break all his laws, including the four principles and cardinal virtues.

Class warfare between the bourgeois and the working classes well-nigh battered Europe to pieces. The bourgeois capitalist world, on the other hand, did not recognize that love is the law of life for the individual and that no selfish man can fulfill himself within himself. He finds and fulfills himself only in the community. The two unhealthy and one-sided extremes resulted in two forms of secularized religion: capitalism and communism, atomic individualism and collectivism. Capitalism made the self-sufficient individual the idolatrous end of his own existence; while communism made society and the state the idolatrous end of the individual. Both were pagan. We cannot baptize our pagan materialistic capitalism and call it Christian.

Neither capitalism nor communism acknowledged that God was the source and center and end of both the individual and society. On the one hand, naturalism and naturalistic monism that sought only man's relation to nature and believed that history was only the end of the evolutionary process, was an error. But so also was the "other worldliness" of religious dualism that conceived the world as a layer-cake affair, clearly divided between the natural and supernatural. At the two extremes man seeks to arm himself either by an individual, or by a collective egotism. By every conceivable heresy and philosophy and by every selfish action self-sufficient man seeks to shut God out of his life, and hence makes history tragic. It is so ordered that human life can not be completely fulfilled in human history. In the end, a godless tragic history should lead man in repentance back to God who is the source of history, who is above history, who is within history, and beyond it. In the end man learns with the Psalmist of old:

Where could I go from thy Spirit,
Where could I flee from thy face?
I climb to heaven?—but thou art there,
I nestle in the nether-world?—and there thou art!
If I darted swift to the dawn, to the verge of the ocean afar,
Thy hand even there would fall on me,
Thy right hand would reach me.
If I say, "The dark will screen me, night will hide me in its
curtains,"
Yet darkness is not dark to thee,
The night is clear as daylight. . . .
O God, what mysteries I find in thee!
How vast the number of thy purposes!
I am still lost in thee.[9]

Although disregarded both by capitalism and communism, all our four principles and the presuppositions of true democracy are deeply imbedded in Hebraic prophetism and in Christian faith. *The very structures of life reveal that there is no way out of our difficulties, no solution of our unsolved problems, and no hope for building a better world in the new atomic age, except in God's way, and by a return to his principles.*

THE PROBLEMS OF AMERICA

Among all of America's unsolved problems, its basic issues lie in its economic system. In its early days, capitalism was well fitted to develop the resources of the richest subcontinent in the world, but laissez-faire gave place to growing monopolistic capitalism with the major natural resources and industries of the nation in the possession of a relatively small group. The system resulted in a vast materialization and secularization which affected every phase of national life—its economics, politics, religion, education and culture.

In our "free" economy, even while we were still on the crest of a postwar boom, we are threatened by a depression as terrible as that during the decade after 1929 which left fifteen million unemployed. It is wholly unnecessary.

---

[9] Psalm 139^{7-18}, Moffatt's translation. See Reinhold Niebuhr, "Will Civilization Survive Technics"? *The Commentary,* December, pp. 2-8.

After our economic blundering following World War I, when the unemployed Legion veterans who had fought in France mobilized as a Bonus Army in the "March on Washington," no way could be found to meet them save by a disgraceful use of force. Raymond Robins, who had helped elect Herbert Hoover, pleaded with the President to give these veterans honest work by building much needed public highways. President Hoover seemed to think, however, that our free economy must automatically recover itself and that any government planning would be almost equivalent to socialism. His remedy was to call upon General Douglas MacArthur to attack these unarmed veterans with tear gas, cavalry and tanks. He had their encampment burned and drove them out of Washington without work. They were only a handful and this historic "battle of Washington" was easily won. Yet it was a symbol.

Let us suppose, however, that we are again as blind as this. If the number of the unemployed should rise once more to from ten to twenty millions, bitter in the memory of their seven hundred and fifty thousand comrades who died on the battlefields of North Africa, Italy, France, Germany, and every embattled island of the Pacific, what would they think of our vaunted free enterprise then? Might they not ask the awkward question, for whom is it free—the owners or the unemployed? The decade of depression following the Coolidge-Hoover slump cost our country eighty-eight million man-years, and a loss of over three hundred billion dollars. A large-scale depression may now be even more fatal.

Only adequate capital investment and consumer spending can prevent a serious depression after World War II. All parties are agreed that the first place must always be given to private enterprise, but the most farsighted see, with Alexander Hamilton, that our democratic government has the definite responsibility of stimulating our free enterprise system. If we would maintain full employment with some sixty million jobs and a national income of from one hundred and fifty to two hundred billion dollars, there would be no depression. Every ounce of government stimulus should add a pound to private enterprise. We should be ready with useful economic enterprises to be provided by the Government whenever private enterprise alone cannot furnish full employment. These enterprises should include housing, T.V.A. projects, public works, and roads. A third of the nation is still ill-housed, nearly half of our homes are below minimum standards, slum conditions exist in almost every city, a fourth of the thirty-seven million dwelling units need repairs, and there is an appalling housing shortage almost everywhere. During the next decade, we need the construction of over sixteen million new units and improvements on ten million existing units. Private and public housing on such an adequate scale would give employment to several million men.

The finest economic project I have seen in America or in the entire world is that of the Tennessee Valley Authority. We need at least eight more such T.V.A. projects in America, involving some thirty billion dollars worth of river-valley developments that would employ over a million men for a decade. Take, for illustration, the St. Lawrence River project. If that river is deepened for a relatively short distance, at a cost of a fraction of one billion dollars, it would add over a billion dollars to the wealth of the States and Canada, employ a large army of men, furnish cheap electric power for the factories, farms, and homes along the borders of both countries, and make port cities, like New York, of Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Toronto, Chicago, and Duluth. It would pay so well that Colonel Cooper's firm, which built the great dams at Muscle Shoals and the Dnieperstroy in Russia, has offered to construct it free of charge if his firm can have the income from the electric power for a few years. Why do we not do these obviously good things?

At Niagara, where an ocean flows over a precipice, Canada taps the power and makes it available at cheap rates for all the factories, farms, and homes of southern Ontario, but the

American power companies of northern New York are horrified at such "wicked socialism." They do not want to see these cities made port cities; they do not want to add a billion dollars to the wealth and prosperity of the common people; they do not want to promote the general welfare unless it adds to their own private profit. Raw capitalism is always essentially selfish. The railways which wish to monopolize the freight, and the private power companies which wish to continue to profit from their monopoly of electric power, will probably succeed in killing this project once again as they have before and will strive to do the same with all the eight needed river projects like the T.V.A. and all other government projects. This will add to the army of the unemployed.

Capitalism in the coming crisis will be facing the same moral issue that slavery faced in 1861, that feudalism faced in France in 1789, and that czarist capitalism confronted in Russia in 1917. I believe that the majority of the American people today are as blind as were the Jews in Jerusalem to the fact that God has been visiting us in judgment. God first educates men by instruction, then by events. He first patiently seeks our evolution by moral suasion. If that finally fails, he permits the volcano to blow up. World Wars I and II were such volcanic eruptions and their material and moral destruction were past human reckoning. I, of course, do not advocate that we plunge from the frying pan into the fire of communism. I only desire a socialized, planned economy whether under capitalism or under the type of socialism of the British Labor Party. I only want to see a growing social ownership of the means of production upon which the whole life of the people depends, and of the processes by which society is fed, clothed, and housed. Our basic demand is for justice, and any economy that will not or cannot give it stands condemned and found wanting under the judgment of God.[10]

---

[10] Arthur F. Burns and Wesley C. Mitchell in their *Measuring Business Cycles*, 1946, find that there have been 26 complete business cycles in the United States between 1836 and 1938, the average length in recent years, being about 42 months. They show that it is fatuous to believe that if only we retain private enterprise without modification we shall be secure.

If God is in history, we shall be driven back to the four inevitable and unescapable principles of justice, brotherhood, liberty, and the love of God and man. If God is marching on to these four goals, we shall be led—or driven—as in the past from slavery and feudalism, now from monopolistic capitalism to a socialized planned economy "with liberty and justice for all."

THE BRITISH EMPIRE

In seeking to understand the place of the British Empire in the postwar world we observe two essential factors that characterize it today: the consistent advance in socialization by the British Labor Party at home, and the tendency to the continuity of imperal policy whether under a Tory or a Labor government. No country in the world has so consistently advanced under the principle of gradual socialization, without a violent social revolution of the French or Russian type, as has Great Britain.

Britain progressed in political liberty for a thousand years but her advance toward the effective realization of economic justice was long obstructed by the three successive economic systems of slavery, feudalism, and laissez-faire capitalism. The story of the rise of labor can be traced slowly from slavery, serfdom, and poverty, through the medieval feudal system and the agrarian and industrial revolutions, to the achievement of political liberty and the gradual growth of industrial democracy. We saw that even as late as the tenth century the price of a linen shirt was equal to that of a slave (white), and a fine piece of armor was worth ten serfs or fifty head of cattle. The Tory Party "of privilege, property, and the peerage" was opposed first by the Whigs, then by the Liberals, and finally by the Labor Party.[11]

---

[11] After more than a century of struggle by the trade unions, Keir Hardy (1856-1915), a Scottish labor leader and Christian coal miner, founded the Independent Labor Party in 1893 and led the Labor Party in the House of Commons, until his successor, Ramsey MacDonald, became a Labor prime minister in 1924 and again in 1929. This first Labor government was in office but not in power. Only in 1945 was there a Labor government in power with a large majority that could plan its reforms in at least a five-year period.

The British Labor Movement developed along four parallel lines: The Trade Union movement as an organization of producers; the Co-operative movement as an organization chiefly of consumers; the Labor Party, as the political instrument of the workers by hand or brain to obtain by legislation and constitutional means a better life for all classes alike; and the Workers Educational Movement to train labor for full citizenship in democracy and for leadership in the building of a new social order. British labor long looked askance at violent Marxian socialism and strongly preferred a policy of constitutional gradualness as advocated by Robert Owen and the Fabian Society. Thus the policy of the British Labor Party is no new thing but its basic demand for justice, its principles and program, have been before the world for more than half a century.

On July 26, 1945, in the first postwar election, despite the enormous prestige of Winston Churchill, British Labor received an overwhelming majority. After centuries of preparation and struggle, by the most mature democratic process in the world the Labor Party believed that it was elected to give justice to all by the gradual socialization of the principal social means of production. British Labor stands forever against the confiscation of private property by expropriation. Early in its first five-year program it nationalized the Bank of England and proceeded toward the nationalization of the coal and power industries, inland transport, and the iron and steel industry. A program of social reform has been launched to build at least eight million houses in the next twenty years.

British Labor stands for full employment and the effective implementation of the Beveridge Report, hoping to be emancipated from the tragic sequence of boom and slump that for more than a century had characterized their own and American capitalism. It has created a government medical service to end the iniquity of one standard of health for the rich and another and lower standard for the poor, despite the attempts of the British Medical Association to blackmail the Cabinet.[12] Britain has introduced measures to insure everyone against the risks of sickness, unemployment, accident disability, maternity, and old age, with grants of eighty dollars each for the funeral of everyone over eighteen years of age. The Labor victory was the inevitable result of a social revolution that has been going on in England for more than half a century.

Each year that the writer returns to England he feels that the heart of Britain is sound—sound as old English oak. Of all the peoples in the world the English and Scotch are probably the toughest. They are not brittle like steel but tough like wrought iron. Emerson's estimate is still true: Britain "has a secret vigor and a pulse like a cannon." If this is so, whether they be poor or rich, their future is assured. While Americans excel in social democracy and the sense of equality, the British are far in advance in political democracy. They fight more fiercely for their liberties and attack more fearlessly the evils in their social order. They are more advanced in self-criticism. In the matter of law and order and good government they have passed permanently beyond the stage of graft and crime, and political gangs like those of the late Boss Pendergast or of Mayor Hague of Jersey City. Christianity has more deeply penetrated to the very marrow of British life—in all its institutions, and in its economic, political, and social life—than it has in America.

We have said that the Labor Party was characterized not only by its consistent socialism but by the tendency to the continuity of its imperial policy with that of the Tories. Mr. Bevin seems no more anxious to liquidate the British Empire than was Winston Churchill. It is very easy for American liberals to say academically that the day of imperialism has passed, but it is not easy to find a concrete settlement of the problems of such countries as India or Palestine that will satisfy all parties. Before Americans preach to the British about the liquidation of their Empire, let them ask how they would view the proposal to acknowledge the injustice of their war with Mexico and to hand back to that country their original possessions of Texas, California, and the five Southwestern states. No matter what Abraham Lincoln or General Grant said about the iniquity of the Mexican war, these states have long been part of our body politic and have shared the priceless benefits of our common life. We would never return them to Mexico, nor submit the issue to arbitration. That is exactly the way the British feel about their Empire, even when British Labor and the liberals are seeking to transform it into a British Commonwealth of self-governing dominions as free as Canada. I am not here seeking to defend all the policies of British imperialism, nor their past actions in India, Palestine, Greece, or Java. I only seek to understand them. Although I have every hope for the new United Nations, the British Commonwealth of Nations has proved itself to be not only the most effective, but almost the only effective international organization that has survived across the centuries.

---

[12] Britain has achieved the enormous advantage of socialized medicine but has preserved freedom of choice and the encouragement of skill afforded by the continuation of private medical practice. The improved health of the poor in Britain in recent years added nine years to human life expectation. Workers, employers, and the state all share in a $600,000,000-a-year health program.

Now that Britain is granting India full self-government on any lines she may herself determine, India's problem is no longer British imperialism, but Moslem bigotry. This has been almost solely due to the ambitious leadership of Mohammed Ali Jinnah whose program of hatred and strife expressed in mob violence has drenched in blood Calcutta, Bombay, and Bengal. The fact, however, that Hindus and Mohammedans have so long lived in peace in the five hundred and sixty-two Indian States under their own rulers leads us to believe that this problem can be settled under the able and distinguished leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru and the wise conciliation of the Viceroy, Lord Wavell.[13]

THE PROBLEM OF PALESTINE

Palestine, as the meeting point of three continents, Asia, Africa, and Europe, has been for centuries a battleground between the nations. Today it is the center where the three great monotheisms of the world impinge upon one another—Judaism, Christianity and Islam—a holy land for all three religions. There has been trouble between the Jews, the Arabs, and the British ever since the controversial Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917.[14] Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin has announced: "We never undertook to establish a Jewish *state* but we did undertake to establish a Jewish *home,* and that we must fulfill." The British naturally are not unmindful of the need for the protection of their lifeline through the Mediterranean and the Suez Canal.

After the slaughter of over five million Jews in Europe, they are reduced to a remnant of about a million and a half, who are still despised, rejected, and homeless. No country will open its doors as a refuge for them, and the shame and guilt for widespread anti-Semitism rests upon us all. The Jews of Europe can still say:

---

[13] According to the census of 1941, there is now in India a population of over four hundred million of whom 255,000,000 are Hindus, 95,000,000 Moslems, 25,000,000 Aninust tribes, 6,000,000 Christians, with some ten million members of four other religions. There are a dozen major languages and several hundred dialects. There are some two thousand different castes and tribes and some sixty million untouchable outcastes neglected by Hinduism. There are 562 Indian states, containing two fifths of India's population, for the most part under feudal autocratic princes who fear any measure of democratic government for their people.

[14] The Declaration reads: "His majesty's government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of that object, it being understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and the political status enjoyed by the Jews in any other country."

The American backing of the Zionist claims is based first on the statement of Woodrow Wilson: "The Allied Nations, with the fullest concurrence of our government, and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundation of a Jewish commonwealth." In 1922 the Congress of the United States expressed approval of the Balfour Declaration, and almost every American President since Wilson has reaffirmed American approval of the undertaking.

> The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests;
> but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.

The Jews have been hounded all over Europe for centuries, and Palestine has been kicked about all too long as a political football. Sympathy for persecuted Jews, however, is an inadequate basis for the support of political Zionism, which is the bone of contention in the Near East. Our American political parties put Zionist planks in their platforms to get votes. For the same reason pious resolutions are introduced in Congress and proposals are made to Britain, while Americans are unwilling to assume any responsibility whatever for the solution of the Jewish problem. The religious, civil, and political rights not only of the Jews but of all the residents of Palestine should be guaranteed by the United Nations if necessary. If the policy of the United States is dominated by Zionists, the Arab world may turn to Russia as their willing champion, and we may find that America is backing the Jews, and Russia the Arabs.

The British and most American liberals would like to see justice done to the Jews and Palestine placed under international control with separate autonomous regions especially protecting the Jews and the Arabs, and Jerusalem as a free city, "the joy of the whole earth." We would like to see Palestine a spiritual and cultural home and a rallying center for the Jewish people of the world. A binational settlement must provide enough immigraton certificates over the next few years to take care of all Jews who must be given a refuge in Palestine, since no other land will receive them. Such a settlement could end Arab fears of a Jewish state. It could fulfill Britain's obligation to both peoples, which she has never yet fulfilled. Any ungenerous plan for the partition of Palestine which will not receive these destitute Jews stands condemned. Our first choice for a settlement would be to follow the spirit and plan of Dr. G. L. Magnes, President of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, who asks for the Jews three things:

> Immigration, settlement on the land, Hebrew life and culture. If you can guarantee these I should be willing to yield the Jewish "State" and the Jewish "majority." I would agree to a Legislative Assembly together with a democratic political regime. If I could know that a Jewish community of 1,000,000 souls—one-third of the population—was possible here I should be well content. The Holy Land is no place for an Arab National State or Government, or for a Jewish National State or Government. It does not belong to Jew, Christian, or Moslem, but to all of them together, to humanity.[15]

THE PROBLEM OF CHINA

The Chinese, as one of the great root races of the world, developed the most massive, homogeneous, and continuous civilization on earth. Our whole Western world owes a debt to this great people for their early discoveries, inventions, and arts. While all the other ancient nations that formed the mid-current of our civilization rose and fell, the Chinese preserved their virile culture for five thousand years. Only they and the Jews seem to go on forever. And God must love the Chinese, as Lincoln quaintly remarked of the common people, if he made so many of them.

The solidarity of early Chinese society was maintained by the threefold organization of the family, the guild, and the government, which produced one race and culture rather than one nation. Everywhere there was racial solidarity and local self-government, but no free individual and no national or political self-consciousness. The trade guild as the organ of economic control enforced honesty in business dealings, but officials were paid only a nominal sum and were expected to supplement this by gifts and reasonable perquisites. This simple custom evolved into the most elaborate and pernicious system of graft and "squeeze" ever known in history. This graft has continued unabated at full tide throughout the awful years of war and the postwar period, while paying lip service to Dr. Sun Yat-sen's three principles of nationalism, democracy, and economic justice, or "the people's livelihood." Despite the strict censorship, American correspondents have revealed that corruption, during the war and after, official and private, monetary and moral, existed throughout the length and breadth of the land.[16] I personally made a study of official corruption during eight long tours through a score of the leading cities of China for three decades, laying the results of this investigation before officials in many cities and provinces. I assembled a long list of quotations from Chinese writers showing the prevailing habit of "squeeze," or graft, among the more selfish officials from the time of the illustrious Han dynasty (207 B.C. to 220 A.D.), and from the feudal period of Confucius, during the decline of the Manchus, and throughout the Republic from 1911 to the present. This graft has so honeycombed and permeated China, that it has almost led to her ruin. Leading financiers made enormous war profits by speculating in gold, American high-octane gasoline was stolen and sold during the war, American relief was stolen, and, while millions were dying of famine, Chinese officers at the front, instead of fighting the Japanese, sold them rice and let their own people starve. America's able ambassador to China, John Leighton Stuart, in the *China Press* of October 10, 1946, expressed the hope of "another internal revolution," against "the narrowly partisan, or selfishly unscrupulous, or ignorantly reactionary forces" (of the Kuomintang) who are the "enemies of China."

---

[15] Condensed from *Like All the Nations,* by G. L. Magnes, Jerusalem, 1930, pp. 6-40.

---

[16] The loyal and devoted friend of China, Dr. Owen Lattimore, speaks for more than a hundred witnesses and writers when he says:

> Paternalism and oppression trace back to the scholar-gentry, or landlord class . . . who combined the grossest corruption (particularly as officials appropriating squeeze from state revenues) with the most delicate artistic refinement. . . . The Kuomintang, as the party that controls the Government, has yet to make a great historical decision—whether it will champion the interests of the people as a whole, or itself submit to domination by the landlords who are the strongest survivors of the old society of China.
>
> Owen Lattimore, *The Making of Modern China,* pp. 32 and 189.

Bishop Hall of Hong Kong writes from West China: "We hear on all sides of the terrible increase in corruption in army and government."

The sad evils developed in the war in both China and Japan were from the corruption of their two chief virtues—family loyalty in China and patriotism in Japan. It was "familism"—where the family mattered more than the nation—that led straight to corruption and bad government in China, and patriotism that led to aggressive militarism and world conquest in Japan.

Concerning China's corruption, among a score of recent books on China the truest picture is given by Theodore H. White and Annalee Jacoby, two of the ablest American correspondents in the Far East, in their *Thunder Out of China.* They show that China, already in the midst of turbulent revolution, must change or die, as it seeks to move half a billion people from the world of the middle ages into the modern world of the atomic bomb. The root problem is whether the dominant parties in China can agree upon a program of change broad enough and rapid enough to meet the desperate need of the Chinese masses for "peace, land and bread," the three imperatives demanded by the Russian revolution. China is divided today into three well defined political groups: the corrupt right wing of the Kuomintang, the men of the middle way, and the radical, revolutionary Communists. The rivalries of these three are backed by the rivalry of the two dominant world powers—on the North is China's immediate neighbor, the Soviet Union, with the greatest land armies in the world, and far away on the East is the U. S. A., which commands the sea and the air.

The right wing of the Kuomintang, controlling the dominant party machine, is the political expression of the Nationalist Army leaders, the feudal landlords, and the war-inflated bureaucracy. This group is the greatest menace to China's peace. They are tainted by corruption and have shown during and after the war their utter inability to govern or give leadership to chaotic China. After Japan was expelled from the coast, the Kuomintang entered to loot, oppress, and misgovern the liberated provinces, even permitting the return of the shameful opium evil.

The second group includes the Kuomintang moderates, the intellectuals and nonpartisan liberals, members of the Democratic League, and the best men in China. They have, however, no army, no political machine, and no roots in the masses or any social class.

On the extreme left stands the Chinese Communist Party. They insist on having a solid base in North China to protect their security and lives and from which they may advance for the conquest of China if the corrupt right wing of the Kuomintang will not keep its pledges and will allow no reforms. The Communists have fought from hill caves and mountain lairs for twenty years and are still unconquered and unconquerable. More than any Communist party in the world, they have kept close to the masses. They are cold-blooded, ruthless, and determined, and will hesitate at no sacrifice for themselves or for the Chinese masses whom they seek to liberate. Mr. White and Miss Jacoby find it difficult to reconcile the graft, extravagance, and debauchery of the worst of the Kuomintang with the stern and puritan fiber of Chiang Kai-shek; yet the power of this corrupt machine over the rank and file of the party members was confirmed by Chiang in person at the party congress of 1945 and at other times.

America also in the recent past has often played a shameful part in betraying her ideals and professions under such representatives as Ambassador Patrick Hurley whose blunders led to our participation in the civil war. We flew government troops into Communist territory; we transported and supplied Kuomintang armies and moved our Marines into north China to support Chiang's regime through fiction after fiction. Vast quantities of our military supplies in the Pacific, the equipment of the new Kuomintang army, the possession of the coastal cities and the Peking-Tientsin area were all the gifts of the United States. Our fatal policy may in time lead to the division of China, with an alliance in the South between the corrupt Kuomintang and the U. S. A., and in the North an alliance of the Communists with powerful Soviet Russia. Such a division might well lead through growing friction to World War III.

From the time of Franklin Roosevelt, through the wise leadership of General Marshall, and now through the fine work of America's Ambassador John Leighton Stuart, we have sought peace and a multi-party government which must include the Communists. If they come in, they will stop China's agelong graft. If we withdraw in disgust and pursue an isolationist policy, there would be no possibility of the survival of Chiang Kai-shek if the Communists were backed by Moscow. In a decade, all China might be under Communist control, and ultimately possibly all of Asia. If civil war should continue, both Russia and ourselves should withdraw our troops, equipment, and all financial and technical aid. Both the right wing of the Kuomintang and the Communists completely distrust each other and both have repeatedly broken their agreements as in the case of the first Marshall truce in 1946. Since Russia does not want world war any more than we do, we should earnestly seek an overall agreement with the Soviet Union and the two warring parties in China and see that it is kept. If there is real peace, a rapidly industrialized China will become one of the greatest markets in the world. If civil war continues and Soviet Russia is drawn in, China may be the occasion and cause of World War III.

CHAPTER VII

THE CHRISTIAN CLUE TO HISTORY

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CHRISTIANITY

WE SHALL FIND THAT CHRISTIANITY, as a developing vital organism, contains a central core of truth, which assimilates from its changing environment all that is germane and essential to its life, and expands until it reaches full maturity. It has the capacity for change and growth, for the adoption of new truth which is in harmony with its own life by the principle of syncretism, and for periodic reformation and revival. At the heart of it, as a living organism, is a vital evolutionary principle, a self-developing spiritual impulse with appropriative capacity. Its center and norm is found at the point where God enters human life in the historic Jesus and in the eternal "spirit of Christ" derived from him. Its core and means in the quickening spirit of faith was "once for all delivered," but not its ever-widening content. Like every other great religious movement, Christianity passed through the stages of the deep emotional experience of discovery, of calm rational restatement, and of volitional ecclesiastical organization.

Christianity today inherits the good and evil, the virtues and vices of its past historic development. As we have said, it began with the religion of Jesus and his proclamation of the fact of the Kingdom of God which his followers are to seek first, last, and always. From the Apostle Paul, chiefly, it inherits the interpretation of Christ's person and work. From the first three Gospels it derives the priceless picture of the historic Jesus, and from the Fourth Gospel the significance of the Incarnation, of the eternal Word made flesh. Gathering up many of these historic elements, Ritschl gives the following definition:

> Christianity is that monotheistic religion wholly spiritual and ethical, which, based upon the life of its author as redeemer and as the founder of the Kingdom of God, consists in the freedom of divine worship, involves the impulse to active conduct from the motive of love, aims at the moral organization of mankind, and lays the basis of bliss in sonship toward God as well as in the Kingdom of God.

As we look back across the historic centuries we see that liberal Christians have had to make several major adjustments to new phases of thought and experience, as they came into contact with secular civilizations. The first was with Greek culture, when somewhat narrow Hebrew religionists came to realize that all things were theirs: all truth, all beauty, all goodness was now their portion—"the world, life, death, the present, and the future"—all now belonged to them. The second major adjustment was with modern science which was in conflict with the world view presented in the opening chapters of Genesis. The rise of almost every science was fiercely contested by the ecclesiastical hierarchy. In the sixteenth century, religion had to alter its view of the universe because of the discoveries of Copernican astronomy. In the nineteenth century it had to come to terms with Darwinian evolution. Today it is having to make an even more important and more difficult adjustment to the modern science of economics which leaves completely out of date the laissez-faire theories of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* in its capitalist economy.

IS CHRISTIANITY UNIQUE?

Christianity is unique in Jesus himself. We have his life as our example. We have his matchless teaching, towering to Himalayan heights in the Sermon on the Mount: "Love your enemies. . . . You must be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect." Crucified, yet living again, he stands alone for the believer as Savior and Lord. Who else can imperatively command us? Who but he can bid us leave all—all that the earth holds for us and all human relationships—and rise up to follow him in his way of life? William Temple shows that he found in Jesus Christ the one and only keystone that completed and bound together all the other mounting but incomplete arches of life. This completion and consummation of life is not found in science, art, ethics, philosophy, or the great ethnic religions of the world, but in "the stone which the builders rejected," a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense. To many of us Jesus is both cornerstone and keystone, both alpha and omega. To man's self-sufficient reason, to his proud science and its glittering achievements, to his skillful arts, to his Stoic morality and pharisaic self-righteousness, to his vain philosophy, to his most costly treasures in his personal, tribal, and national faiths, which one and all fall short of completion and lasting satisfaction, is not Christ himself the only possible answer to humanity's agelong quest?

Man as a creature cannot find a true norm for his life short of the nature of ultimate reality. His only adequate norm is found in the historic incarnation of perfect love—a love so perfect that it transcended history and appeared in history only to be crucified by man's hate. Jesus' followers felt that in him they were somehow confronted with the ultimate Reality of existence. In counting him as the "second Adam" in whom sinful humanity might get a fresh start, they believed they found in him the final revelation of the character of God, of the true character of man and of the meaning of history. His followers were so convinced of Jesus' perfect love, that they interpreted him as the revelation of God who is love, and conceived of the ultimate Reality behind the universe as "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Somehow Jesus made a terrific impact upon his followers and upon history. This carpenter had left no book, no written page, yet he was to be more quoted than any writer in twenty centuries of history. His teaching was to be translated into more than a thousand languages, and twenty-six million volumes of the Scriptures were to be issued annually in the crises after World Wars I and II, because men found that his words were spirit and life. A hundred writers in varying language have said with Dostoevski: "There is in the world only one figure of absolute beauty: Christ." Certainly Jesus was truly man; but what manner of man? If this man supremely reveals God as Father to man; if he is the highest embodiment of human character that we know; if he dared to offer and continues to offer salvation to man; if he triumphs over the unsolved problem of evil, and over man's last enemy, death—is he not indeed unique? May we not in some sense see in this limited and truly human life the Incarnation of God?

If this is his significance Christ thus becomes the center of history, dividing the old from the new, realizing prophecy and achieving its fulfillment. The believer looks back to the record of the teaching of Amos, Isaiah, or Jeremiah under the Old Covenant of the Law. He looks up to the fullness of the divine life—"the fulness of the Godhead bodily"—in Christ as his Head, the author and finisher of his faith, and the completion and fulfillment of his being And he looks forward as he seeks an ever-increasing approximation to the Kingdom of God in his improving but ever-imperfect social orders; but only eternity can fulfill what time has begun. We believe that God is laboring with divine power and patience within history, but that his full purpose and the splendor of his infinite Being will be realized only in the Kingdom of God beyond it, where all history, however real and tragic, will be seen as only an interim.

Faith is the response of the whole personality in moral obedience to God's revelation of the way, the truth, and the life. The Bible offers no speculative proof of the existence or of the character of God or of the fact that he is working in history. The revelation of God in history reaches its climax in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus as the Head of a new creation, a new race of men, however imperfect they may be at present, for it does not yet appear what they shall be. Leslie Weatherhead makes a valuable and clarifying distinction between: (1) The intentional will of God—his ideal plan and first choice for men; (2) The circumstantial will of God—his plan within certain circumstances, which is often his second choice, the best he can do after man's failure and sin; (3) The ultimate will of God—or the final realization of his purpose of redemption for man.[1] For instance, in the matter of the Cross of Christ, God's first choice, his intentional will, would surely be that Jesus would be accepted as his people's Messiah and followed, with the fulfillment of all God's promises. But when in hate he was crucified, the Cross became God's circumstantial will and Jesus could then say in the agony of the garden, "Not what I will, but what thou wilt."

In these circumstances the shameful crown of thorns, the agony of the nails, the breaking of his heart in the despairing cry, "My God, my God, why?"—all become part of God's circumstantial will. When God's ultimate purpose for the redemption of man is finally fulfilled, it will surely be a better, happier, holier, and more triumphant Kingdom of God fulfilled beyond tragic history, than if there had been no sin and its consequent inevitable suffering. Since suffering may become the chief means of grace for sinful man, no circumstance, or disease, or death, has been allowed that could finally defeat God's ultimate purpose for the maximum of good for all within man's tragic history.

THE JUDGMENT OF GOD IN HISTORY

At all times, but especially at a time like the present when we have endured the agony of World Wars I and II and their aftermath, Christians must realize that they are standing under the judgment of God. A God who is at once holy and loving must redeem, but he must also judge, and holiness and love do not cancel each other out. The God and Father of Christ crucified is righteous love. He is a father but not a sentimental grandfather. He not only marks the sparrow's fall but there is a stern element in his righteousness and an awe-full element in his holiness, as revealed in the whole life and teaching of Jesus. From the time of Amos, it is held that God judges among the nations, especially Judah and Israel, because they have rejected the Eternal's way of life and trampled down the poor. Therefore will God chastise his sinful people after sending what were regarded as his warning judgments of famine and draught, plague, earthquake, and war. They must now prepare to meet their God. The prophets conceive God to be at work in all the events of history but especially in certain acts of judgment. Isaiah sees Assyria as the rod of divine anger, while to Jeremiah Babylon is his battle-axe. After Hosea we cannot thing of God's judgments as punitive vengeance but as redemptive and costly to himself. For the Eternal has betrothed unfaithful Israel "in a bond of goodness and justice, in kindness and in love."

---

[1] Leslie D. Weatherhead's *The Will of God,* New York, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1945, p. 20.

When Jesus stood before Pilate's judgment seat, when he dealt with Judas, the Pharisees, and their court, he saw through them to God the Father and the ultimate Judge who alone gave Pilate power to crucifiy him. Jesus was dealing not primarily with Pilate, or Judas, the man who drove the nails into the cross, or the raging Pharisees, but always in all the events of life immediately and ultimately with his heavenly Father. In the light of Jesus' life, death, and resurrection, his followers had now a completely new standard of judgment. They saw that Jesus had come not to judge but to save the world. It was no longer under the old covenant of the Law, for the Father had committed all judgments to the Son, i.e., all is to be judged by the new standard of Jesus, his Incarnation, Atonement, and Resurrection. Under Christ, sinful human history stands as judged and in contradiction to the divine will on every level of its moral and religious achievement. Apparently Jesus saw the inevitable destruction of Jerusalem—where the temple was to be left without one stone upon another—as the judgment of God upon the nation that was rejecting and crucifying its long-awaited Messiah: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, slaying the prophets and stoning those who have been sent unto you! How often I would fain have gathered your children as a fowl gathers her brood under her wings! But you would not have it! See, your House is to be left to yourselves. I tell you you will never see me till the day comes when you say, Blessed be he who comes in the Lord's name."[2] We can see clearly God's inevitable judgment of love upon Jerusalem. What many do not see is that this is God's own cry, not only over Jerusalem and the Jewish people, but over all the tragic history of humanity in so far as it tries to live independently of God. The pride of Greece and of Rome, of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, of the nineteenth century and its scientific achievements, and of proud, victorious, rich America, is the same in principle as that of Jerusalem, and our blindness is the same as theirs. This is the tragedy of history, not of the Jewish but of the human race. Jerusalem's cross and Jerusalem's judgment is ours.

W. R. Davies in Great Britain discusses *Divine Judgment in Human History*[3] as seen in our contemporary world. In the mortal sickness of Western capitalist civilization, he sees divine judgment evident in history in this era of crisis, war, and revolution. In the prophetic tradition, divine judgment was a principle in history; it was a continuing process rather than an isolated dramatic event; it was a fruition of man's independent and rebellious way of life rather than an external verdict; it was the visible descent into history of the transcendent. Under Roman law and medieval doctrine, judgment was regarded as discrete, isolated, and occasional. The Black Death seemed such a visible divine judgment for the sins of medieval Europe. But when divine judgment was interpreted as external and partial, operating from without, it seemed to leave whole tracts of historic development free of judgment and untouched by it.

---

[2] Luke 13^{34-35}.

[3] W. R. Davies's *Divine Judgment in Human History*, 1943, London, The Sheldon Press.

Visible judgments like World Wars I and II are only the final phase of a long hidden process when God's judgment should become perceptible to even the dull-witted, fatty-hearted, natural man. Man's natural creative power, in so far as it is not consciously dependent upon God and his way of life, is inevitably self-destructive. We saw that the Renaissance, as the source of our modern European culture, asserted a new sense of individuality, but when it became a revolt, not only against the medieval Church, but against God, man falsely claimed to be his own creator and builder. Man as an independent self-creating individual has had four centuries since the Renaissance to demonstrate his achievements, and he has turned his proud humanistic dream into a nightmare. He has produced not only all his economic, political, and religious systems of extreme, ruthless individualism, but also "a society of masses of uniform, patterned, de-personalized humanity." Man has produced a new tribalism and a new totalitarianism in which he has tried to live by bread alone. Man's vaunted new freedom-in-isolation, and his will-to-power has turned to slavery and we see the self-destructive character of human nature when independent of God.

Of the twenty-one civilizations studied by Arnold Toynbee, we saw that not one in the entire world has ever enjoyed continuous, uninterrupted progress. Every one of them underwent first, a phase of progressive advance; second, a phase of retrogressive decline, punctuated by ups and downs; and third, a final phase of utter collapse or partial integration in a new society. Independent man is a great builder, but when alone, he builds his towers of Babel. When he believes he is on the point of becoming a scientific superman, he often ends, like Nietzsche himself, in suicide. Pertinax has described in his *Grave Diggers of France* the suicide of a partially degenerate nation betrayed by her false leaders, such as Petain, Laval, and others who were tried and condemned before the world. André Maginot spent over two billion dollars on the Maginot line but it was France's greatest danger. The line ended at a point in the mid-north beyond which her blind leaders trusted to luck or the goodness of God. Despite the revelations of young Captain de Gaulle, France in wishful thinking clung to her delusions and her heavily fortified mirage of self-deception which proved to be no stronger than tissue paper. France, though no worse than that of many other nations, was a rotting organism, defeated by French materialism, by her own corruption, and betrayal from within, long before the German attack. Her rich families preferred the appeasement of Hitler to granting any measure of economic justice under premier Blum. When Chateaubriand said of the Terror of the French Revolution, "This bloody ditch will never be filled in," he was unconsciously including future leaders like Petain and Laval who for a century and a half fought against the liberty, equality, and fraternity of the French Revolution.

Victor Hugo, however, unlike the French skeptics and politicians was not ashamed to affirm that he saw God in history. In his *Les Miserables,* in speaking of the Battle of Waterloo, he says in brief:

> In order to make Waterloo the end of Austerlitz, Providence only required a little rain, and a cloud crossing the sky at a season when rain was not expected. That was sufficient to overthrow an empire. . . . That brilliancy called history is pitiless; it has this strange and divine thing about it. . . . The greatest predestined men offer these contradictions, for our joys are a shadow and the supreme smile belongs to God. . . . It seemed to Napoleon as if destiny had made an appointment with him on a fixed day. He exclaimed cheerfully to Soult: "We have ninety chances out of a hundred in our favor." The plan of the

> battle he had drawn up was excellent. Wellington was retiring. . . . Napoleon hurriedly turned and sent off a messenger at full speed to Paris to announce that the battle was gained. . . .
>
> Was it possible for Napoleon to win the battle? We answer in the negative. Why? On account of Wellington, on account of Blücher? No; on account of God. Bonaparte, victor at Waterloo, did not harmonize with the law of the nineteenth century. . . . It was time for this vast man to fall; his excessive weight in human destiny disturbed the balance. . . . Streaming blood, over-crowded grave-yards, mothers in tears, are formidable pleaders. . . . Napoleon had been denounced before the infinite, and his fall was decided. Waterloo is not a battle but a transformation of the universe. . . . Did this vertigo, this terror, this overthrow of the greatest bravery that ever astonished history, take place without a cause? No. The shadow of a mighty right hand is cast over Waterloo; it is the day of destiny, and the force which is above man produced that day. . . . On that day, the perspective of the human race was changed, and Waterloo is the hinge of the nineteenth century. The disappearance of the great man was necessary for the advent of the great age and He who cannot be answered undertook the task. . . . Let us render to God the things that belong to God.

To Victor Hugo, as to the believing Christian, history is not merely a series of events; it is "a transformation of the universe" accomplished through men like Napoleon, mixtures of good and evil, under an overruling Providence of God. In contrast to Victor Hugo, a blinded man, on the eve of World War II in Britain, Godfrey Winn, wrote in the *Sunday Express*: "Praise be to God and Mr. Chamberlain," while the editor of the *Hornsey Journal* recorded: "Next to our Lord, I think Neville Chamberlain is the greatest man who ever lived." This was at the very hour when Chamberlain almost betrayed and lost the British Empire by his appeasement of Hitler. We see the self-deception of governments and peoples blind to the process of divine judgment. "Thou turnest man to destruction—and sayest 'Return ye children of men.' " Under the divine judgment "narrow is the way and straight is the gate that leadeth to life—and few there be that find it."

We must realize that prosperous America cannot escape the divine judgment any more than other nations. Henry Ford's dictum that what is economically profitable must be morally right is merely the mirage of an economic Maginot line. Ford formally lined up with George F. Baer, Chairman of the American coal owners who, in resisting the claims of the miners, said: "The rights and interests of the laboring man will be protected and cared for, not by labor agitations, but by the Christian men to whom God in his infinite wisdom has given the control of the property interests of the country."[4] Unfortunately such a fascist view is shared by many Christians, blind to its deadly danger. Pertinax records that France was betrayed by her "two hundred rich families." They are not different in principal, however, from the sixty families in which the far greater wealth of America is said to be concentrated. Perhaps history is even now dissolving the illusion of modern Western capitalist society as it did of the score of civilizations which preceded it. Feudalism was the temporary solution of the contradictions of the previous slave society. The French Revolution was the final dissipation of the feudal illusion and its contradictions. Capitalism was the temporary solution of a disintegrating feudalism, but it too has now come under the divine judgment for its monstrous injustice, its failure in distribution, and its denial of brotherhood. Let us not be deceived by temporary prosperity. Babylon and Rome were once prosperous. God is not mocked. Our civilization must come under the divine judgment just as Toynbee's twenty-one civilizations that preceded it. It is to be feared that the deep realization of this is largely lacking in the materially prosperous but spiritually shallow experience of Christianity in America. If there is any power or justice in divine judgment, we cannot put the clock back to slavery or feudalism, nor justify the monstrous injustice of capitalism disguised as "free enterprise," but must go on to a system of abundance and full employment in a socialized planned economy. We must realize that *each one of us and our whole materialistic wartorn civilization is standing even now under the judgment of God.*

---

[4] *Epic of America,* p. 181.

FROM WAR TO PEACE

The various plans for postwar reconstruction and world organization are of two general types, realistic and idealistic. The first represents the historical realistic school of politics; the second is rationalistic in method and idealistic in temper. The first asks the practical question, "Imperfect as are the power politics of the Big Three and the United Nations where do we go from here?" The second deals not so much with actual perennial conditions as with absolute ideals, new possibilities, the goal of a just and durable peace, and a final "federation of the world." As an idealist, for instance, Cordell Hull in his numerous speeches declared with wishful thinking that peace is "normal" and war "abnormal" in history. Dr. Ivan Bliokh, however, in his six volumes on *The Future of War* (1899) declared that in the last twenty-five hundred years the world has enjoyed peace one year in twelve and endured war the other eleven years. Since 1878 the world has had four "peace" years, the last of which was in 1910.

The somewhat cynical N. J. Spykman, in his *America's Strategy in World Politics,* sees no hope beyond a temporary balance of power and maintains that "war is unpleasant, but it is an inherent part of state systems composed of sovereign independent states." He does not see that an unorganized balance of power is potential anarchy. In Professor Quincy Wright's *A Study of War,* he shows that during the last 461 years, from 1480 to 1941, the number of wars in which various nations have taken part was as follows: Great Britain 78 wars, France 71, Spain 64, Russia 61, Austria 52, Turkey 43, Sweden 26, Italy 25, Holland 23, Germany 23, China 11, and Japan 9 wars. Of all these nations Japan alone was defeated but once. Professor Wright credits the United

States with 13 wars in 150 years, but the War Department records show that 110 wars were fought against the Indians alone, and we landed our troops in Latin American countries many, many times to forcibly support our dollar diplomacy with the big stick. After perusing Quincy Wright's list of wars fought it is difficult to tell just which were "the peace loving peoples."[5]

A realistic record of the wars upon our planet must not blind us, however, to the growing and insistent demand for peace, especially since World Wars I and II. President Edward Benes of Czechoslovakia, in his *Democracy Today and Tomorrow* (1939), shows that the League of Nations, with all its imperfections, was a great and lasting achievement as an expression of the democratization of the world, in its moral, cultural, political, social, and economic life. He holds that the ideal of eternal peace is almost as old as humanity, especially from the time of Confucius, Zeno, Seneca, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius and primitive Christianity. There was a league or federation of the Greek states to preserve peace in 497 B.C. To mention but one or two among scores of efforts for peace, there was the Truce of God in the Middle Ages, the Swiss Federation in the fourteenth century and the Peace League in the fifteenth, the work of Grotius and of Comenius in the seventeenth, while Kant's *Toward Perpetual Peace* placed him among the fathers of the League and of the United Nations.

Throughout the nineteenth century, countless peace societies were formed by practical men to influence public opinion. The first Hague Conference of 1899 and the World Peace Congress of 1893 in Chicago led on to the final Hague Peace Conference, the development of arbitration and the organization of the World Court. Conservative and nationalistic influence tried to block these ideas for a whole century, but World War I drove the powers to organize the League of

---

[5] Quincy Wright, *A Study of War*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1942, 2 vols.

Nations in 1919, and after World War II they were coerced by the growing demand of public opinion to draw up the charter for the United Nations at San Francisco. Just as more than a century of agitation led to the abolition of slavery, the agitation of the last century has reached its cumulative climax in the present demand for peace. This is the crucial issue of our day. Realists must recognize, however, that this is the most titanic and difficult task ever undertaken upon our planet. It will take time. We shall not be frightened by what we consider the exaggerated statement that another total war will destroy our civilization. Sir George Paget Thomson, chairman of the committee of scientists to study the development of atomic power, shows that despite our ever more destructive weapons, our proportional losses in men in World Wars I and II were only one third and Germany's losses were far fewer than in the Thirty Years' War, when gunpowder was in its infancy. We must realize that modern wars are carried on between nations *where there is no international government.*

Professor Mortimer J. Adler in *How to Think About War and Peace* (1944) tries to show that throughout history properly organized government means peace—whether in city, state, nation, or the world—while anarchy means war. With rigorous logic but vast oversimplification, Professor Adler states that the *only* cause of war is anarchy. As long as there are some sixty "sovereign," independent, and irresponsible nations that make up the present anarchy in the world, we shall have war, for "anarchy and sovereignty are inseparable." He thinks it may be five hundred years before enough men want the things that make peace possible. Mr. Adler's interpretation of society, however, is too purely political, for he regards government as the sole agent of unity in a community, which it is not. He underestimates all the nonpolitical and nonrational factors in the development of limited communities and national states, but seems to think that an international community can be easily created by the power of an international state. He says nothing about the transfer from national to international sovereignty but thinks it is to be made by a supreme act of human will on the social contract theory. Just as all communities and states have grown through the gradual coalescence of smaller communities, so at this very hour—despite the menace of World War III—we are in the midst of the vast process of slowly building the world community and the distant world state, through ever-imperfect power combinations, first tried in the now obsolete League and at present in the United Nations.

We repeat that the task of organizing the world for peace instead of war is the most difficult, the most complex, and the most august ever undertaken by man. The Christian at least should know that the creation of some form of world community, compatible with the necessities of a technical age, is the most compelling duty of our day. As surely as God was working in the creation and growth of Ur, Egypt, Palestine, Greece, Rome, and in modern states, so truly is he working in the imperfect United Nations toward a great and durable peace of a federated world of justice, brotherhood, and liberty in the love of God and man. Both idealists and realists, pacifists and nonpacifists, will have their part to play in organizing the world for peace and building a better social order.

Neither party, however, must be blind to the problem of power. Historical realists know that history is not a simple rational process but a vital and dynamic one. All human societies are power organizations of diverse vitalities and interests Some dominant power lies at the center of every social organization and some balance of power is the basis of whatever justice is achieved in human relations. The absolutists do not realize that no historical process has ever, even remotely, conformed to the pattern which the idealists have mapped out for it. And no collective group in history has ever made decisions in a vacuum. We must start, not with some utopian ideal plan, or some constitutional convention of the world, but with some concrete group of imperfect nations which had power enough to win the war, like the Big Three, and have power enough to keep the peace if they have the will to peace. Realists dare not ignore the factor of power. Something more is required to reform the confirmed drunkard than one more signing of the total abstinence pledge; and something more is required for peace than the signing of another pledge of total abstinence from war as an instrument of national policy, as in the Kellogg-Briand Pact of Paris. In some way an economically interdependent world must become a politically integrated world community.

If history has any meaning or any lessons to teach, we should take time to recall why the League of Nations failed, if we hope for any better results from the United Nations. We can now see that instead of being a normal, healthy growth, the League was too suddenly imposed by Woodrow Wilson and the Big Four; it was chained to the punitive terms of the Versailles treaty; it contained no adequate provision for peaceful evolutionary change; and its required rule of unanimity enabled any small nation to block urgently needed action. The absence of the United States from Geneva, the later betrayal of the League in turn by Japan, by Italy, and Germany, and the final lack of backing from both Britain and France, the two chief supporters of the League, were all responsible for its failure. Though the majority of the Senate and of the American people favored the League, Woodrow Wilson's inability to work with an opposition and his obstinate intransigence prevented the reversal of four votes in the Senate which would have made the United States an initial member.

Again, it was not so much the League that failed as the nations which composed it. We have already quoted Mr. Harold Butler who said: "More than for any one reason the peace was lost because the policies of the nations were empty of charity toward each other." Even more important was the fact that the League was little more than a debating society of the victorious nations and that there never was any world organization with power to act. If Japan seized Manchuria, Mussolini Ethiopia, or Hitler the Rhineland, Austria, or Czechoslovakia, the feeble League could only entreat Britain or France to do something about it, but it could take no effective action itself. Finally, there was no adequate world brotherhood, no world citizenship, no world public opinion and responsibility to support the League. And here almost every one of us failed the League. We as individuals were members of our church, our city, and our nation, but what did we do to support the League? How far were we—or are we today—intelligent and active citizens of one world?

THE CHRISTIAN AS GOD'S INSTRUMENT

In the Report of the Commission of Christian Scholars appointed by the Federal Council of Churches, on *The Relation of the Church to the War in the Christian Faith,* published in 1945, twenty-six members of the Commission were in general agreement that we are now in the midst of one of the great transitional periods of human history. We seem to be in a kind of "thirty years war," the end of which cannot yet be clearly seen. A life and death struggle is going on between various old ways of living and various new ones in this world revolution, and unorganized struggles, both armed and unarmed, will continue. This crisis is a dynamic readjustment of impersonal forces, and the violent threshing of physical, biological, and economic factors long out of balance—as in the matter of economic injustice—released in destructive spasms during the last thirty years.

In a distinctively Christian understanding of our situation, the war is an event in the providential reign of God, a tragic moment in God's work of creating and redeeming man. Ultimately the only way out is to seek to transform our interlocked society into world community. To some it seems that God is aloof from his tortured world, to others war seems a direct and fearful act of divine judgment, to still others it seems that war is a stunning defeat for God's purposes, at the hands of successful human rebels. There is no event in history, however, in which God alone is present. War is not simply a natural fact, nor an act of God, nor only a sinful choice of man. It is a complex event in which all these factors are present. God takes sides throughout each struggle, with the impulses toward good and against the impulses toward evil in every man and in every group in both camps. God is, in war as in peace, the Creator and Sovereign whose power sustains and governs, but does not annul, the activities of nature and of men. In a general sense war is a crucifixion of both man and God. A majority of Christians believed that war against the Axis powers by all needful measures was in fact justified. A very small minority believed that those Christians were judging more accurately the meaning of Christian duty who in time of peace preach the renunciation of war, and in wartime follow the way of conscientious objectors.

We must realize that Christians always have differed on this matter across the centuries. In the light of World War II, Christians must realize that in the modern world, under the aggressive attack of a Hitler or a Hirohito, *they are confronted as a final alternative in the choice between the two evils of total war and total slavery*. Both are awful evils. Christians must forcibly defend their country and their civilization with all the evils that modern war entails, or they must offer no forcible resistance and submit to the slave state of the military conqueror or gangster. Neither of these, by any stretch of the imagination, is sinless perfection; both are boundless evils and our choice must be one of these two evils. One may be a conscientious defender of his country; he may feel that he must play his part in the front line of defense, motivated by Christian love—to God, to his country, and even to his enemies, or he may be an equally conscientious objector; he may take his place in the pacifist camp, seeking to maintain a conscience void of offense, but unable to make the supreme sacrifice that others are making for him. Either alternative is an evil, however, and neither the conscientious defender nor the conscientious objector can judge his brother, or ask "What shall this man do?" For myself I take the position of the conscientious defender of my nation and the world rather than the conscientious objector.

The Sermon on the Mount furnishes the best example of Jesus' authoritative teaching. Jesus' point of view is the pure and perfect will of God, not human ability. Literally to give to every beggar, to make no provision for the future, to "sell what you possess and give it away in alms," to part with your garments, to offer no resistance to any evil or evildoer, would lead to social anarchy. But prophets and poets are often compelled to use such bold language and to appeal to the imagination and spiritual understanding of their hearers. Jesus saw intuitively the law of God as a moral order written in the very structure of the universe and in the soul of man, to which men should conform in humble obedience and complete faith.

Jesus imposes no rigid precepts which are right in all circumstances. If I am his follower my duty is only to do the will of God as revealed in Jesus and interpreted by God's Spirit, just as Jesus interpreted the Law by his own spiritual insight, and just as Protestants are to interpret the whole Bible in the light of the New Testament, and all of it according to "the mind of Christ." Behind all law lies the single ultimate duty of love. Just as love is the ultimate law of life and the source of all our other cardinal principles of justice, brotherhood and liberty, so *love is the one and only absolute obligation in Christianity*. Separate precepts are obligatory in concrete circumstances *only* when they express the duty of love. The context of the precept not to resist evil but to turn the other cheek always forbids personal egotistic retaliation. But when resistance arises out of concern for the lives of others dependent upon us, the injunction gives us no guidance. My clear duty is to love, but there is no guaranty in Scripture or in human experience that if I do turn the other cheek and feed my enemy, it will always succeed and bring him to repentance, or that he will yield his life to love. If a man does me a personal injury by striking me on the cheek, my duty is clear, but if I see a bully beating a little child, a man violating a helpless woman, or money-changers making the house of God into a den of robbers, there is no precept that tells me what to do. If the Good Samaritan had arrived while the robbers were beating their victim, what would have been his duty? Love will bid me do what is best for all concerned, whether by giving positive aid to the injured, or by nonviolent or forcible resistance to evil.

Jesus did not say, "If a man take the widow's cloak, let him take the orphan's coat also." If I am to do unto others as I would be done by, love will show me how to act. If I were the child being beaten, or the woman being wronged, or the man being robbed, or if I were the criminal or violator, or a money-changer in the Temple, if I had any spiritual understanding I would not want anyone merely to turn the other cheek to me in the bondage of prosaic legalism or literalism. Some, like Gandhi in our day, are undoubtedly called to be vocational pacifists, but for most of us it is gratuitous and misleading to identify love solely with nonviolent resistance, or any other specific method or technique. The Sermon on the Mount gives the Christian a principle of love as the spirit in which he is always to act, but never a rigid precept for specific action in all circumstances. It is only the legalist, the literalist, and the absolutist who will so misunderstand it.

At this point we see Tolstoy led into error by making the text, "resist not him that is evil," into what he calls "the new law." There can be but one sun, one center, in a solar system. That center for the Christian is love—to love God, our neighbor, and even our enemies. Unfortunately that center Tolstoy never found, for his demonic pride disrupted every friendship and almost every relationship of his life.

even that of his own unhappy and quarrelsome home. All resistance to evil or evil men became for Tolstoy the one sin. If this were rigidly applied, it would finally disrupt the state, the church, and all organized society. For all his high ideals it frustrated Tolstoy's own unlovely character.

The rational basis of conduct seems to be found in experience interpreted by reason. Jesus said: "Why do you not yourselves settle what is right?" The basis of Christian conduct is experience, interpreted by reason, in the spirit of Christ. But what is the spirit of Christ? Is it Jesus dying upon the Cross, crying, "Father forgive them," or is it the same Jesus, motivated by the same love, driving the money-changers from the Temple in flaming moral indignation? We believe it is both; for God judges and he redeems; Christ judges and he redeems, in righteous love. The state must judge, and according to Paul, the earthly state is divinely authorized and organized upon a basis of force. While the state must organize man's secular life and wield power, the church must redeem and proclaim God's gospel of love. The Christian, as a member of both state and church, must live in two worlds. He must as a citizen render to Caesar the limited, qualified obedience to the state enjoined by Jesus, and as a child of the heavenly Father, he must render to God the absolute, unqualified obedience due to him.

We have no record that Jesus ever told any centurion or army officer to throw away his weapons and leave the army. Why, if his teaching regarding nonviolence had been explicit, were some of Jesus' followers, including their leader, Simon himself, carrying swords on the last night? And what did he mean by telling each disciple to sell his cloak and buy a sword? Was it for self-protection? Certainly it was not for his protection, for the Savior of the world could have no weapon used for him in his cause. That is a very different matter from the magistrate, or president, or policeman, or citizen of a state holding the sword in self-defense, or "for the maintenance of order, constituted by God" (Rom. 13^{1-9}).

St. Augustine and the majority of Christians for nineteen centuries have understood that devout believers should not resist *personal* injuries, but that the duty of the forcible protection of the state and the defense of their country was God's will for them. Undoubtedly some are called as vocational pacifists, but the majority have always felt it to be their duty when their country was attacked to be its conscientious defenders rather than conscientious objectors.

All without exception, however, are called to be makers of peace and builders of a warless world. Someday, we shall do away with war as once we did away with slavery. In relation to both evils, the absolutist and the relativist, the idealist and the realist, will each doubtless have his part to play.

IS GOD LIMITED?

There is a certain dualistic structure observable in human experience to which philosophy, science, and especially religion, testify. Much of human experience is in the form of opposition and struggle. We see throughout biological evolution and human history signs of progress, rational ends attained, and values achieved, but they are always costly and slow, with a large measure of failure on every level of advancing evolution or human history, as if there were enormous difficulties in the way. This is observable in the agelong process of evolution, even before history is darkened by man's sin. Instead of a march straight from the amoeba to *homo sapiens,* there appear many apparent failures; many species perish or do not seem fit to survive, such as the Neanderthal man. Countless trivialities and monstrosities seem to appear, and nature to the sensitive poet looks red in tooth and claw and deadly with venomous reptiles and saber-tooth tigers.

Epicurus, writing some twenty-two centuries ago, observed the dilemma which other thinkers have stated in varying language during all the centuries since: If God wishes to prevent evil but cannot, then he is impotent; if he could but will not, he is malevolent; if he has both the power and the will, whence then is evil? General Smuts in his *Holism and Evolution* (1926) is only one of several hundred modern writers who speak of "the dark opaque character" of the universe—ethically and rationally. Men of faith, however, have always believed that there was some adequate explanation of this dark mystery which is at present hidden from us.

In considering the age-old and probably insoluble problems connected with the idea of divine sovereignty and human freedom, we have to ask their bearing upon our reading of history. Has God a sovereign purpose for the world which he will realize within history or beyond it? How far is man free and responsible and is he able temporarily to thwart God's plan for the coming of his kingdom? How does the interplay of divine sovereignty and human freedom affect history? John Calvin, following Augustine and Aquinas, is confident in the assertion of divine sovereignty. There is an element in Calvin, however, that is at times humble and cautious and that does not allow his dogmatism to run away with him. Like Luther he reminds himself that God is in heaven and man upon earth:

> For how can the infinite essence of God be defined by the narrow capacity of the human mind, which could never yet certainly determine the nature of the body of the sun, though the object of our daily contemplation? How can the human mind, by its own efforts, penetrate into an examination of the essence of God, when it is totally ignorant of its own? Wherefore let us freely leave to God the knowledge of himself. For he alone is a competent witness for himself, being only known by himself.

Unfortunately Calvin does not always remember this, but he wisely concludes:

> We must proceed with modesty, cautious that we call not God to an account at our tribunal; but that we entertain such reverence for his secret judgments as to esteem his will the most righteous cause of everything that he does.[6]

---

[6] *Institutes,* Allan translation, Vol. I, pp. 137, 195.

The Christian must seek no escape in a dream world but must face fearlessly the darker side of life. I recall three of my friends the first child of each of whom was born with a deformity: one with a harelip; one feeble-minded; and one so defective that he seemed an idiot. We would be asked by John Calvin to believe that before all eternity, God, in his eternal decrees, had directly caused these three defective children to be born just as they were. But such a belief does not justify the ways of God to the modern man. It does not seem to exhibit God's goodness. Of my three friends, the first lost his faith and has been a wistful agnostic ever since; the second and third could not understand the evil but they triumphed over it in radiant Christian faith. They found that much of the evil in the world cannot be explained away, but that it can be overcome. They discovered the solution not in the speculative but in practical reason, not in abstract theory but in loving action to perfect the imperfect. And they were reminded that "Christ also suffered." The crucifixion of Jesus seen in isolation was the worst crime and the chief evil in history, but if taken as a part of the whole scheme of things and in the light of God's ultimate purpose, it not only could be made but has been made part of man's supreme good. If that evil can be completely transmuted and transfigured, then, presumably any evil can be, if rightly born in "faith working by love." The world may then be a better world with a greater sum total of good for all eternity than if evil, sin, and suffering had never occurred.

Man is always his own greatest problem. The awful fact of evil in the world is the hardest question man has had to face, and the weight of suffering is the heaviest burden he has had to bear. The problem of evil is the very crux of theism for we are compelled to ask how the presence of such a staggering mass of evil and suffering in the world is compatible with the belief that the world is created and ruled by a God who is both infinite goodness and infinite power. Even David Hume admits, however, that if we could be sure on rational grounds of a good God, the problem could be solved. He says: "There are many inexplicable difficulties in the works of Nature which, if we allow a perfect author to be proved *a priori* . . . become only seeming difficulties for the narrow capacity of man, who cannot trace infinite relations."

In analyzing our problem we may consider intellectual evil or error, physical evil or suffering, and moral evil or sin. For many of the worst evils man is wholly responsible, such as slavery, war, city slums, and social injustice; for some evils, like certain diseases, he is partly responsible and can often remove them; for some of the evils in his environment, like the cyclone and the earthquake, he does not seem to be in any way responsible. There can be a "problem of evil" only in a world that is essentially good. There is no problem of good, for the world is not prevailingly bad. All suffering at longest is temporary. Let us not assume that all the woes and ills of human life are intended to be accepted with complacency. Many of them were never sent by God and were never intended to be borne by man. Liebnitz would see with Pope "all partial evil universal good." He believes he can discern a soul of good in all things evil, with the conviction that if God exists there is nothing absolutely evil. Where there is room for doubt there is room for faith also, if the possibility implied by freedom is essential to the greatest good of the whole. Certainly the Christian theistic ideal adds immeasurably to the infinite value and worth of the world and to the meaning of tragic history.

Some have found the solution of evil in the world in the idea of a limited God. They save the supreme essential of God's goodness and love and are willing to yield something of his sovereignty and omnipotence which are morally less important. They feel that they cannot both have their cake and eat it; that they cannot claim that God is absolutely omnipotent and all loving at the same time and yet account for the awful volume of evil throughout nature and history. Dr. Edgar S. Brightman, after his study of evolution and after vicariously suffering the depths of human agony in a survey of the sufferings of man, came to a conclusion that is rationally respectable and that is one way of meeting frankly this dark side of life. He believes that God is a Person supremely conscious, supremely valuable, and supremely creative, yet limited both by the free choices of other persons and by restrictions within his own nature. Dr. Brightman thus states his position:

> God is a conscious Person of perfect good will. He is the source of all value and so is worthy of worship and devotion. He is the creator of all other persons and gives them the power of free choice. Therefore his purpose controls the outcome of the universe. His purpose and his nature must be inferred from the way in which experience reveals them, namely, as being gradually attained through effort, difficulty, and suffering. Hence there is in God's very nature something which makes the effort and pain of life necessary. There is within him, in addition to his reason and his active creative will, a passive element which enters into every one of his conscious states, as sensation, instinct, and impulse enter into ours, and constitutes a problem for him. This element we call The Given. The evils of life and the delays in the attainment of value, in so far as they come from God and not from human freedom, are thus due to his nature, yet not wholly to his deliberate choice. His will and reason acting on The Given produce the world and achieve value in it.[7]

If we say that God is a spiritual personality we mean that he is pure self-conscious experience, combining the utmost variety and complexity within the unity of one life, and that he is actively engaged in realizing the ideal values of reason, goodness, beauty, and holiness. To hold that God is personal does not of course imply that he is human, or subject to human limitations. But if we say that he is suprapersonal, implying as many do that he is mere pantheistic blind force, our suprapersonal turns out to be subpersonal. The goodness of God, rather than his power, is his central essential attribute. Evil is a problem only because there is some good which we are not now attaining and which the evil prevents our attaining. The finite created world is not evil because of its finiteness. The world is not evil because it is temporal, and matter and the body are not the source of sin in man. Neither is sin a mere biological holdover of the evolutionary process, or an imperfect adjustment to environment. Whether consciously or unconsciously, sin is rebellion against God in the center of man's free spirit. The Christian doctrine of creation preserves the transcendence and freedom of God; it maintains the goodness of creation because it is created by the good God; and it holds that the world of nature and human history are meaningful because they are God's.

---

[7] E. S. Brightman's, *The Problem of God,* New York, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1931, p. 113. In his later writings, *The Finding of God* and *A Philosophy of Religion,* New York, Prentice Hall, 1940, Dr. Brightman includes laws of reason in The Given and now speaks of The Given as of two sorts: the rational and the nonrational.

A century ago the great Kirkegaard of Denmark discovered that nature and the absolute were seemingly cruel. He held that at a deeper level than Descartes' position, "I think, therefore I am," he found the truth in his own experience, "I struggle, therefore I am." In suffering and anguish, in passionate identification with the eternal, in Christianity, came his final encounter with God. In Christ he found all that God is and all that man is. In suffering and the daily discipline of life, the dross and impurities of character are released, rise to the surface and are continually skimmed off until, "as a refiner and purifier of silver," the Lord of Suffering sees his own image perfectly reflected in us.

The Christian does not glibly claim that he has all the answers to all man's problems. He does not deny that God is a problem to us, as we are to him. He believes that God is creative, supreme, personal, though he may be in some way genuinely limited. Nearly all will agree that God is self-limited in man's freedom. The enormous power for evil possessed by a demonic Hitler is surely at least a temporary limitation upon God's supreme purpose for good. We do not hold that God is the voluntary cause of all human misery, though we believe he is able to bring ultimate meaning and value out of all possible suffering. We do not hold with Aristotle, or Locke, or Leibnitz, that the proof of God's existence is easily comprehensible or rationally sure. We observe, however, that literature, art, morals, and religion are quite different in a civilization in which God is believed, from what they are in one in which he is not believed. Complete proof of God would require complete knowledge of the universe and a longer span of life than mortal man's brief day. We recognize that we are ever under the limitations of relativity. There is an element of faith and logical incompleteness in all human knowledge that falls far short of demonstration. Though the world keeps on growing and evolution is still going on upon our unfinished planet, we do not claim that either evolution or history is an open book, that he who runs may read at a glance.

The idea of God that we hold is no idle speculation but represents millenniums of the deepest growing thought and experience of the human race. Around this faith in God all our ideas of values have crystallized and upon it as a firm foundation the best human life that we know has been built. We believe that God has a purpose for the maximum development of worthy human persons and that the imperfections of the cosmos do not interfere with this. If life were a mere garden of delights, fitted for lotus eaters and dreamers, how could man be developed apart from the suffering and tragedy of life? Indeed our imperfect developing world seems on further thought to be strangely fitted to an imperfect developing man. Seen in the eternal perspective of man's sin, might it not be the best of all possible worlds for the development of character for those who have faith in God and who will co-operate with him in achieving his purpose?

When Professor Brightman concludes that God is limited not only by the free choices of other individuals but by the restrictions due to The Given within his own nature, he does so because he believes that the only evidence for God lies in experience, and experience seems to record these apparent contradictions. He thus seeks to account for the slow and painful processes of life and the fact of earthquakes, cyclones, disease germs, and other evils in the world. Evolution seems to display prodigality and wastefulness as entire species perish, while disease germs and parasites seem almost exclusively harmful. God seems to be working against obstacles not of his own making. Nature thus exhibits not only design but apparent frustration and delay. Some have held that this element of apparent opposition is the product of the creative will of God; others that it is something external to God as believed in Zoroastrianism and certain forms of modern dualism or belief in Satan. Dr. Brightman concludes, however, that it may be due to factors within God himself, which are eternal aspects of his nature but not products of his will and choice. On the last view the perfection of the universe is "a dynamic ideal, not a static fact," and the perfection of God's world consists in its perfectibility. God then suffers but does not deliberately choose the cruelties of evolution and the unjust agonies of his creation. Hegel's principle of dialectic, which sees all reality full of opposition and contrast, seems to support the same conclusion that the divine life consists of struggle and victory, that God is the greatest sufferer in the universe and through this the greatest victor.

We should be quite willing to go the whole way with Dr. Brightman if we were forced to do so either in logic or in experience, but we do not find it necessary to conclude that these limitations lie within God's own nature. The whole structure of the universe in every atom, as shown by the atomic bomb, bears evidence of incalculable and inconceivable power. We believe, with Dr. Brightman, that there is evidence that God has power adequate to his divine ends, that he is able to do all that his character and purpose suggest. We are willing to say that God is self-limited in human freedom and that this increases the difficulties and the suffering for both God and man in the agelong processes of creation and redemption. We hold that as his power is infinite, even more so is his love, as revealed in the Cross. Therefore, we conclude that we and the whole universe have just the God we need—personal, all-loving, inconceivably powerful, but self-limited in the freedom of man, who is so exalted that he may be truly said to be created in the image of God. He is the God of history and his end is sure.

THE FINAL SOLUTION

Have we enough data in our experience and study of events to form an opinion as to whether God is working in history, or must we go halting forever between two or more opinions, as palsied agnostics? It might clear the air for some of us to realize that *if Christianity is true we have in it the final solution of our problem.* Certainly from the first chapter of Genesis to the last of Revelation it is the unswerving conviction of Hebrew-Christian faith that God is indeed in history and that he is working effectively to accomplish his own great ends. Apart from the religion of the Hebrew-Christian Scriptures when obeyed and applied to all life is there any other satisfactory solution for the world's moral and spiritual problems? When some of the followers of Jesus were stumbled by his terrific demands for unconditional commitment to his arduous way of life and they were asked if they would turn back from following him, their leader replied: "To whom shall we go?" Was there any other hopeful way open for them—or is there for us?

Disillusioned as we now are in this period of world wars and world revolution, could we turn with any hope to the reactionary and counter revolutionary way of fascism after it has been so thoroughly tried and so utterly discredited by Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, and every other fascist or nazi leader? Could liberals who have known the four freedoms even under our confessedly imperfect democracy commit themselves with confidence to ruthless communism? Despairing of fascism and communism, could we look for the solution of our manifold problems—moral, spiritual, economic, and political— to modern science, to any known system of philosophy, or to nontheistic humanism? Science has proved that it can destroy, but can it create, mould, and motivate a new spiritual world? Or can any system of philosophy or impotent nontheistic humanism do so? Can John Dewey's agnostic philosophy move us to lift ourselves by our own bootstraps by a little more intelligence, or education, or reform, when it knows no God to turn to?

Let us turn next to the great religions of the world, every one of which contains, admittedly, priceless truths. Can Gentiles find the solution of their problems in Judaism and the Law of Moses? If we turn to Buddhism—whether polytheistic, atheistic, or philosophic—despite its once being the "Light of Asia" which admittedly uplifted many from their former animism and primitive Oriental faiths, have we of the practical West any hope of saving ourselves or the world by its rigorous eightfold path of self-discipline? Or, we may study Hinduism, as the vast composite of the cults and castes and creeds of India. While great souls like Gandhi undoubtedly find satisfaction in this religion, can it do for Western civilization what it has failed to do for India itself? Though many admire the fervid monotheism of Islam, could we find more hope of solving our problems by following its command to take the sword for world conquest, than in the peaceful injunction of Jesus? More imperative than ever in the new atomic age are his words: "Put your sword (or atomic bomb) back into its place; all who draw the sword shall die by the sword."

Many of these systems and philosophies and religions—whether polytheistic, pantheistic, agnostic, or atheistic—have been tried again and again for the last six thousand years, from the early days of Ur and Egypt and of Greece and Rome to the present. In contrast to all of these, is there not a simpler way of faith, and hope, and love? If love is the final law of life, is not this way truer than any other to the actual structures of man's existence? Has it not been verified and validated by the experience of Jesus, the prophets and a great and growing multitude across the centuries? Surely this way of life is not too good to be true. Admitting that anything priceless is costly, surely we cannot complain that it makes too deep a moral demand upon us. If there is nothing we must needs believe save the truth, and if truth may be verified one step at a time in daily experience, is there anything in Christianity, reduced to its simplest terms, impossible for us to believe? Surely Jesus never asked his followers to accept any formal creed. Rather he bids us follow him and his way of life in moral obedience.

Could not the greatest doubter put his way of life to the test, as did the great rationalist Albert Schweitzer? If he will do so, he will prove with a countless multitude the truth of the experience of Schweitzer himself in his often quoted words: "He comes to us as One unknown, without a name, as of old, by the lakeside, he came to those men who knew him not. He speaks to us the same words: 'Follow thou me!' and sets us to the tasks which he has to fulfill for our time. He commands. And to those who obey him, whether they be wise or simple, he will reveal himself in the toils, the conflicts, the sufferings, which they shall pass through in his fellowship, and, as an ineffable mystery, *they shall learn in their own experience who he is."*

In the light of long perspectives, we think we can see unmistakable signs of progress in history, although that progress is never automatic. In the light of our second chapter on "God in Evolution: in Nature and History," we believe we can see God working over vast spaces and periods of time, first in inorganic, then in organic evolution, over more than a thousand-million-year period. Just as we can follow a fundamental pattern in all stages of man's development from the embryo to the fully matured personality of *homo sapiens,* so in our astronomical photographs we can see one fundamental pattern manifesting itself "in embryonic universes, infant universes, universes nearing adulthood and universes fully grown up."[8]

In material techniques, scientific progress in Western civilization is unmistakable. We have traveled a long way from the stone age to the use of electric and atomic power. We have seen, however, that material progress is not necessarily moral progress, which is much more difficult. At this point we agree with Reinhold Niebuhr that however great humanity's advance in civilization, sin reappears on every higher level of his achievement; and man's history is always tragic. We must not mistake the advance of our ever-improving social orders for the coming of the Kingdom of God. We are not pessimists, however, in our view of history. If God is in all history, we would expect to see signs of progress. Even though man is not yet perfect and though it does not yet appear what he shall be, there is surely advance from the amoeba to Einstein, and from the primitive savage to Isaiah and Jeremiah as well as to Shakespeare, Beethoven, and Rembrandt. Although the skull of the Peking man is estimated by experts to be about half a million years old, ancient monuments suggest much less than ten thousand years of human history on our young and immature planet. Man is still in the making.

We find both an evolutionary and a revolutionary principle at work in history, as long periods of patient preparation are interspersed with rapid cataclysmic change. We are not discouraged by inevitable periods of disintegration and decay at the end of each epoch as one social order makes way for another that is better, as we pass from the economic order of slavery, feudalism, and capitalism towards a socialized planned economy under the ideal of liberty and justice for all. Neither are we overwhelmed by signs of war or revolution which now hang over us. John Macmurray, in *The Clue to History,* shows that Jesus, in describing conditions that will arise in human progress, provides for just such developments:

---

[8] As Dr. Hubbell said to a worldwide gathering of scientists at the dedication of the new giant telescope in Texas. *The New York Times,* May 8, 1939.

> "Nation shall rise against nation. . . . But when these things begin to come to pass, lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh." In other words, to take the collapse of a civilization as proof that things are going badly is to misunderstand the process of history. It is a sign that things are going according to schedule.[9]

Economically man has unmistakably advanced from the time of the building of the great pyramids under the slave-whip in Egypt, or from a thousand years ago in England when the price of a slave was the same as a linen shirt. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, unskilled workmen in England received less than two cents a day, or $6.66 a year. Their real wages and their whole standard of life was immeasurably lower than today.

Morally also man has advanced, however slowly. When Jesus entered the world, slavery was practically a universal institution. Within a century the condition of slaves had been ameliorated in Rome; and, chiefly as the result of the agitation of Jesus' followers, slaves were finally freed in every Christian country, and ultimately the slave trade was prohibited even in the dark continent of Africa. The movement to outlaw war has gathered headway in a similar manner and will probably reach its successful climax in the new atomic age. Womanhood has been uplifted, emancipated, educated and ennobled. Christianity has taught the sacredness of childhood and has fought against infanticide, child labor, and exploitation. The sacredness, the security, the inviolable, priceless value of human personality, and the protection of individual rights, through bills of rights and other legislation and custom, have been steadily advanced across the centuries.

Religiously we do not have to look back to any golden age in the past. We have advanced immeasurably from the temple prostitution of Ur and its pantheon of five thousand gods, from the animal worship of Egypt, from the polytheism of Greece, Rome, and the pagan world. The truth of ethical monotheism, with higher standards of morality, widening education, the healing of the sick and the ameliorization of social evils reached its zenith in the nineteenth as "the great century," with its world-wide Christian missions which went beyond even those of the apostolic age. Deeply as we deplore the weakness and limitations of the churches, *we Christians hold the greatest power for truth, for health, for reconciliation, for good, that this planet has ever witnessed.* There is nothing else that can be compared with it. Surely in these and a hundred movements we can see God at work in history.

---

[9] John Macmurray, *The Clue to History,* New York, Harper & Brothers, 1939, p. 92.

CONCLUSION

At the close of our long survey, how shall we answer the question *Is God in History?* We have labored under no illusion in writing this book. We cannot demonstrate the existence of God to those who do not believe—especially to those who do not want to believe. Similarly we cannot prove to such that God is always and everywhere working effectively in history. Our readers, like all men, are of two kinds: those who have had direct experience of God in life and those who have not. Those who experience God in their own lives will have no doubt that God is working in all men and in all history, as he is in themselves. They may be able to see God working on every page of the record and to believe that he has been in every act and incident of history in the making, whether his will was being done or flaunted by free men.

If we recall the brief outline covered in this volume some of us think we can see God in the history of Ur, as the first high city civilization, where the Sumerians were working for all posterity. However unconsciously, they were making *for us* their great discoveries in the art of writing (in Sumerian, the sole written language, *circa* 3500-2500 B.C.), in irrigation, mathematics, astronomy, architecture, noble building, metal working, sculpture, a high code of laws, commerce, credit, and a score of conditions that made Western civilization possible. We can see "the dawn of conscience" in Egypt, the further development of moral character and high religion; the early hope of personal immortality centuries before that of the Jews; the demand of social justice for the poor peasant; the remarkable achievements in the development of agriculture, irrigation, building, mathematics, and astronomy; the calendar and the clock; primary, secondary, and technical education, as well as high achievements in writing and literature, science, and medicine. All these were not lost but contributed to the Phoenicians, Syrians, Jews, Cretans, Greeks, Romans, North Africans, and Asiatics—*and to us* for posterity.

Most of all, in the mid-current of Western and universal history, we can see God working in the long development of ethical monotheism of the Hebrews. From the dim traditions in the time of Abraham of Ur, from the God of Sinai of Moses, up to the conception of the God and Father of Jesus of Nazareth, who summed up all the Law and the prophets in his two great commands as the highest point of religion realized on earth, we can see God working for the development of ethical monotheism as the only possible basis for world religion.

We can see God at work, not only in the deep but somewhat narrow religion of the Hebrews, but in the broad culture of Greece. Our Hellenic heritage was necessary for the full realization of our manifold life—moral and spiritual, intellectual and esthetic, political and economic—for the whole personality of the individual and for a fully integrated social order. We can, through Thucydides, glory in the age of Pericles as part of our own early history. We claim Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, as well as Abraham and Moses, Amos and Isaiah. In our development are included not only the religion and morality of the Hebrews, but science, philosophy, and literature, the politics and economics of democracy, and all our rich pluralistic life which we owe chiefly to our Hellenic heritage.

We can see God working for nearly twenty-seven hundred years from the founding of Rome, through the Republic and the Empire, from Julius and Augustus Caesar to Marcus Aurelius and Constantine, in the development of law and order and good government for all the world and for us. As Alexander the Great founded the first short-lived world empire, Rome build the first enduring universal rule and gave peace to the world under the Pax Romana. The great Roman synthesis was able to gather up, conserve, and apply in practical statesmanship many of the values discovered or achieved by the various peoples.

At last in the fullness of time, the world was ready for God's complete entrance into history in One who formed the center of history, who divided it between B.C. and A.D., who revealed its source, its full meaning, and its ultimate end. In Him, uniquely, we experience God, we realize that God is in us and in all history. The empire of Alexander, the great synthesis under the empire of Rome, and the United Nations form three steps or stages toward the realization of one world, co-operating and integrated. Only a united world can end war and realize God's purpose of peace on earth and good will among men.

If there ever was a time of crisis in history, surely it is now. The early discovery of fire, or of the uses of steam or electricity, did not begin with the all-destructive power of the atomic bomb. Man had millenniums in which to experiment with fire, a century in which to develop the uses of steam and electricity, but the crisis precipitated by the atomic bomb is immediate. As Emerson says: "Now is the nick of time in matters that reach into eternity." If God is in history at all, it must be he who has permitted this crisis to be precipitated. All the other great revelations and discoveries of life came in "the fulness of time," when man was prepared for and in need of each particular development.

We can no longer halt between two opinions as to whether God or man is the center and source of human existence. We have no time to sing with a Nietzsche or a Hitler, Swinburne's pean: "Glory to Man in the highest! for man is the measure of things." History reiterates that in that way lies destruction and death. Neither need we halt long to inquire what is God's way for us today? Over weary millenniums, in the sweat, blood, and tears of prophetic experience, the way has been made plain from the time of Abraham of Ur, and from Amos of Tekoa, to Jesus of Nazareth. Written in the structure of life itself, confirmed by the total experience of man, in the beginning and in the end we find that love is the law of life. Love and not hate, creation not destruction, redemption not doom.

And from love, the universal experience, man derives the four principles of life, the four conditions for a just and lasting peace, the four cornerstones on which alone we may build a new world, the fourfold criterion of judgment for our social orders, and the fourfold solution of all our problems whether spiritual, moral, economic, or political. We have found that these four principles are justice, brotherhood, liberty, and the love of God and man, realized fully only in vital religion which acknowledges God as the only center and source of life. As all roads lead to Rome, all right paths lead in the end to truth, and all religions ultimately to God. But, at long last, there is no other way but God's way, and there is no other name that offers ultimate hope for man but his: "There is no salvation by anyone else, nor even a second Name under heaven appointed for us men and our salvation."[10]

The whole theme of this book may well be summed up in the Revised Standard Version's translation of Romans 8^{28}: *"We know that in everything God works for good with those that love him, who are called according to his purpose."*

---

[10] Acts 4^{12}.

Here we have God's "intentional" will for good for man; his "circumstantial" will in *everything*—in all the suffering and sorrow, apparent failure, and physical death, man's last enemy to be conquered; and God's "ultimate" will of final redemption for man and the complete fulfillment of his purpose in the eternal Kingdom of God beyond history. And we notice that God works *for* and *with* those who love him, *in everything.*

But how about those who do not love him? We have already seen that God loves them whether they as yet love him or not, and it is the reality of God's character, love, purpose and activity that counts, rather than man's feeble and fitful realization of that reality. We are sure that he always works for the ultimate good of all whether they love him as yet or not. He works with those who do not love him when they are unconsciously doing his will—as in the case of Soviet Russia's passionate seeking of what we call economic justice and brotherhood, the two principles in which we have so disastrously and disgracefully failed. We are equally sure that he effectively works against all those who are not doing his will. Intellectually we think and know only in part and always find the quest for certainty vain. Morally, in experience, however, we are able to say with Paul in this great context, "we *know*":

> We *know* that in *everything* God works for good with those who love him who are called according to his purpose. . . . What shall we say to this? If God is for us, who is against us? . . . Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? . . . No, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him who loved us. For I am sure that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.

In this sense we know:

God is in History.

Index

INDEX

Abraham, 52-57, 69
Absolute, 111, 112
Acropolis, 85
Acton, Lord, 129, 132
Acts of the Apostles, 135, 275, 276
Adams, John, 163
Adler, Mortimer, 251
Africa, 36, 38
Agnosticism, 12
Albright, W. F., *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 35, 46
Alexander the Great, 50, 86-90
Alfred, King, 160
Allenby, Lord, 66
American Dream, 161-163
Amos, 20, 25, 39, 69, 73, 89, 105, 106
Anaximander, 78
Anderson, Paul B., 196
Anglo-Saxons, 16, 158-170
Animism, 3
Apostle Paul, 11, 12, 42, 100
Apostles, 68
Aquinas, Thomas, 110, 136
Aramean, 68-70
Archaeology, vii, 45, 71
Armageddon, 66
Aristotle, 73, 77, 79-82, 86-90
Atlantic Charter, 22
Assyria, 72, 105
Athens, 79-88
Atomic age, 7, 22, 216-223
Augustine, 102, 105-110, 142
Augustus, 95-102

Baals, 68
Babylon, 50-55, 70, 71, 88
Bacon, Francis, 154
Balfour Declaration, 231
Barth, Karl, 142
Barton, George A., 70, 71
Bedouin, 72
Bennett, John, ix
Benes, President, 205, 250
Berdyaev, Nicolas, 143-144
Berkeley, 152
Beveridge Plan, 211, 228
Bible, 71, 73-76, 104, 105
Biblical Philosophy of History, 104-105
Bismarck, 127
Bomb, atomic, 216-223
Brahmans, 44
Breasted, James Henry, 57-61, 65, 66
Brest-Litovsk, 176
Brightman, Edgar S., viii, ix, 17, 262-264
Britain, 97, 159-161
British Labor Party, 227-230
Browning, Robert, 1
Brotherhood, 14-19, 20-21
Bryan, William Jennings, 29
Buckle, Henry, 142, 143
Buchan, John, 97-100
Buddha, 14, 73
Burbank, Luther, 35
Butler, Harold, 23, 255
Business cycles, 226

Caesar, 90, 96, 127
Caesar and Christ, 93
Calvin, John, 260
Canaanites, 67
Canterbury, Dean of, 204
Capitalism, 116, 120, 213-214
Carchemish, vii, 46
Carlyle, Thomas, 132, 166
Catholic Church, 108, 151-153
Center of History, 11
Chaldeans, 66
Chamberlain, William Henry, 177
Charlemagne, 136
Cheops, 59
China, vii, 14, 44, 186, 233-237
Christ, viii, 6, 11, 12, 74-77, 96-103, 238-244
Christianity, 9-10, 98, 99, 151, 152, 238-246
Christian Church, 67-72, 152
Christian view of history, 11-14
Churchill, Winston, 179-180, 228-230

City of God, 102, 104, 105
Civilization, 55-61, 146-150
Cochran, Charles N., 109
Coffin, Henry Sloane, ix
Communist Manifesto, 116
Communist Party, 122
Comte, 138
Confucius, 72
Conscience, 57-63
Constantine, 135
Coolidge, Calvin, 164, 165, 179
Copernicus, 114, 125, 217
Covenant, 11
Crises in history, 146-150
Criterion for history, 14-19
Croce, 25
Cro-Magnon man, 36
Cromwell, 126
Culture, 147-150
Cuneiform writing, 49-52
Cyprian, 102
Cyrus, King of Persia, 89, 205
Czechoslovakia, 205

Daniel, 60
Darwin, Charles, 9, 30, 31, 115
David, 68, 72
Davies, W. R., *Divine Judgment in Human History,* 244
Democracy, 16
Demonic aspects of life, viii, 9, 10
Descartes, 137, 152-155
Design in history, 3, 5
de Tocqueville, Alexis, *Democracy in America,* 208
Deuteronomy, 71
Dewey, John, 119, 148, 268
Dialectic, 118-120
Dorme, 54
Dualism, 3
Durant, Will, 51, 65, 77, 78, 90-95
Duranty, Walter, 178, 179
Dynamic conception of history, 13

Earle, George H., 182
Education, 35-43, 94
Edward the Confessor, 160
Egypt, vii, 20, 43, 57-65
Einstein, 30, 43
Embryo, 28, 29
Emerson, 4, 229, 274
English history, 5, 159-161
Enlightenment, 1, 149
Epictetus, 21
Equality, 16
Eskimo, 44
Eusebius, 109, 135
Evil, problems of, 261-264
Evolution, 9, 27-43
Exodus, 71

Fabian Society, 228
Faith, 13
Fascism, 129
Federal Council of Churches, 192, 193
Feudalism, 115-119
Feuerbach, 117
Fisher, John, 184, 185
Flint, Robert, 89, 136-139
Flood, 45, 47, 51, 69
Ford, Henry, 248
Four Principles, 19-24, 76
Francis, David R., 177
Franklin, Benjamin, 163, 164
Fraser, Sir J. G., *The Golden Bough,* 39
Freedom, 21-22, 80-85, 113
Freud, Sigmund, 155-156
Funeral oration of Pericles, 83-85

Galileo, 108
Gamaliel, 18
Gandhi, 268
Gautama Buddha, 14, 73
Genesis, 29, 30, 70
Gettysburg Address, 84
Gibbon, 89-96
Glover, T. R., 89-93
God in history, 1-19, 21, 74, 89, 272-276
God, the existence of, 1, 2, 75, 109, 112, 113, 264, 265, 272
God, limited, 259-267
Gospels, 74-78, 99, 100
Great Britain, 19, 92
Great Commandments, 15
Greece, vii, 3, 4, 13, 22, 23, 76-90, 273

Haeckel, 31
Haldane, J. B. S., 30
Hammurabi, 51, 71
Hardy, Keir, 227
Hebrews, 6, 14, 22, 53, 65-76
Hegel, 6, 22, 24, 110
Hellenic heritage, 76-90
Herder, 42
Herodotus, 4
Hinduism, 44
Hiroshima, 219
Historical criticism, 4
Historical relativism, 4
Hitler, viii, 124, 127-129, 179, 180, 181
Hittites, 50
Homer, 78, 82

Hosea, 72, 73
Hook, Sidney, 119
Hoover, Herbert, 178-180, 224
Hugo, Victor, 246
Hume, David, 14, 24, 152
Hurley, Patrick, 186, 236
Hutchinson, Paul, 209
Huxley, Julian, 30, 34, 35

Iliad, 86-90
Iknaton, 61
Immortality, 59-63
India, vii, 44, 88
Inorganic evolution, 27, 28
Intellectual certainty, 2
Isaiah, 74, 105
Israel, 6, 67-70

Jacob, 55-57
Jahweh, 68, 72
Java man, 36
Jeans, Sir James, 32
Jefferson, Thomas, 166
Jenkins, William Sumner, 166
Jeremiah, 39, 89, 146
Jerusalem, 87, 244
Jesus Christ, viii, 6, 11, 74-76, 97-103, 239-244
Judea, 13
Judgment of God in history, 242-249
Julius Caesar, 93-102
Jung, C. G., 156
Justice, 14, 19-20, 165-167

Kant, 117-119, 141, 152
Keith, Sir Arthur, 45, 66
Kelvin, Lord, 29
Kierkegaard, Sören, 142, 264
Kingdom of God, 5-14, 104, 239, 242
Kingdom of God in history, 9, 13, 104, 239, 242
Kingdom of Israel and Judah, 6
Kuomintang, 233-237

Labor Party of Britain, 117
Langdon, S., 48-49
Laotze, 73
Laplace, 156
Laski, Harold, 119, 156, 217
Lattimore, Owen, 234
Law, 78-82, 89-95
League of Nations, 23, 253, 254
Leibnitz, 139, 140, 152
Lenin, 120-124, 174-177
Lessing, 142, 143
Liberty, 14, 21-22, 69
Limited God, viii
Lincoln, Abraham, 84, 217
Lindsay, A. D., 119
Livingston, Sir Richard, 42
Livy, 42, 91
Locke, John, 152
Lodge, Sir Oliver, 8
Lods, Adolphe, 67-68
Lord of history, 10, 56
Love, 14, 22-24, 134
Luther, Martin, 110, 149-151, 153-155
Lyman, E. W., 9

Macaulay, 154
Macedonian phalanx, 86-88, 93
MacArthur, General Douglas, 181
Macmurray, John, 270-272
Machiavelli, 154-156
Magna Carta, 5, 91, 160, 208
Magnes, Rabbi G. L., 233
Man, 7, 33-35
Marx, 19, 114-124, 191, 192, 201, 202
Masaryk, President, 206
Materialism, 3
Meaning of history, 1-26, 73, 75, 76, 98, 99
Mechanism, 3
Megiddo, 66
Memphis, 58
Menes, King of Egypt, 50, 58
Messiah, 6
Mexico, 36
Micah, 74
Middle Ages, 150-152
Mid-current of history, 44-52
Mill, John Stuart, 48
Mitchell, Wesley C., 226
Mohammed, 55
Mommsen, 94-95
Monotheism, 11, 68-72
Moon god, 55
Moral law, 2
Morgan, C. Lloyd, 33
Moti, 14
Moses, 70-74, 77
Mumford, Lewis, 157
Murray, Gilbert, 4, 83-85
Myrdall, Gunner, 167, 168

Nannar, the moon god, 47, 55
Napoleon, 90, 91, 98, 127, 197, 247
Naturalistic interpretation of history, 2, 3, 4
Nature, 2, 10
National Socialism, 124-129
Nazis, viii, 17, 31
Nebuchadnezzar, 45
Neanderthal man, 36, 66

Neolithic, 38, 39
Nero, 99
New Testament, 24
Newton, Sir Isaac, 30, 77
Nicolai, Russian Patriarch, 198
Niebuhr, Reinhold, ix, 8, 142-144
Nietszche, 31, 127
Noah, 47

Optimism, 1
Origin of Species, 30
Osiris, 60-63
Oversimplification, vii
Owen, Robert, 228
Oxford Conference, 9

Pacifism, 254-259
Paleolithic age, 31
Palestine, vii, ix, 65-74, 102, 231-233
Parmenides, 78
Parthenon, 58
Paul, 69, 77, 99-105
Peking man, vii, 36
Persia, 4, 87
Pertinax, *Grave Diggers of France,* 246, 249
Peloponnesian war, 86
Pericles, 84-86, 273
Petrie, Flinders, vii, 72
Pharisees, ix
Pharaoh, 59-63
Philip of Macedon, 79, 86-88
Philosophy of history, 6, 89, 104-145
Pilate, 91
Plato, 14, 19, 20, 23, 48, 73, 77, 109, 117, 125
Polybius, 91, 137
Pompey, 95
Pope of Rome, 211-212
Prayer, 2
Primitive man, 3, 37, 41, 42
Problem of evil, ix
Prophets, 6
Providence, 10
Prussians, 111
Public health in Russia, 202
Purpose in history, 2, 3, 5
Pythagoras, 73

Race problem, 168-170
Rank, Otto, 156
Ratzel, Frederick, 30
Religion, 17, 18, 47-50
Reformation, 110, 125, 146-150
Renaissance, 1, 110, 146-150, 245
Republic of Plato, 19, 78, 85
Revelation, 73
Revolution, 117
Robins, Raymond, 176
Romanticism, 148, 149
Roosevelt, F. D., 186-188
Rousseau, 117
Roman synthesis, 90-102
Rome, vii, 10, 13, 90-102, 105-110
Rubicon, 95
Russell, Bertrand, 12
Russia, 16, 19, 29, 123, 124, 143-145, 158-164, 169-176

Sabbath, 48
Sacrifice, 41
Sargon, 49
Schelling, 141
Schweitzer, Albert, 269-272
Science, 2, 3, 24
Schuman, Frederick, *Soviet Politics,* 174
Scriptures, 17, 66, 67
Secularism, 151-158
Sergius, Russian Patriarch, 196-198
Shema, 15
Signs of the times, ix
Sin, 6, 15, 16, 73
Slavery, 116-118
Smuts, General, 260
Socrates, 43, 73, 77, 78-85, 108
Solon, 78-80
Soviet system, 116-122, 143-145
Sparta, 78-95
Spencer, Herbert, 9, 19
Spengler, 124-129
Spinoza, 152
Spykman, N. J., 249
State, 120
Steinbeck, John, 185
Stone, Gilbert, 160
Stone age, 36
Stoics and stoicism, 16, 21, 97, 98
Suffering, 43, 74, 112, 113
Suffering Servant, 74
Stuart, Leighton, 234
Sumerians of Ur, vii, 43, 45-52
Sun Yat-sen, 233-234

Tacitus, 99, 100
Tapestry, warp and woof, 5, 7
Tell-el Amarna, 60-62
Temple, William, 152-154, 204, 240
Tennyson, 1
Terence, 101
Tertullian, 17, 102
Thales, 78
Tiglath-Pileser, 72
Thucydides, 83-84

Tiberias, 99
Tillich, Paul, ix, 9, 213
Tolstoy, 201, 257
Toynbee, Arnold, 100, 101, 129-135, 245, 248
Tragedy in history, 7, 10
Trever, A. A., 35
Tubigen, 111
Turville-Petrie, F., 66
T. V. A. project, 225
Tyler, Sir E. B., *Primitive Culture,* 39

Ubaid, 45
Unity of man, 101
Upanishads, 44
Ur of the Chaldees, vii, ix, 43, 45
Utopia, 79

Value, 2, 25
Van Dusen, Henry, ix
Voltaire, 137, 138
von Hugel, 152
von Ranke, 141

Wallace, Alfred Russell, 31
Wallace, Henry, 183, 184
Watson, J. B., 156
Weatherhead, Leslie, 242
Weimar Republic, 210
Wells, H. G., 35
Werth, Alexander, 192, 193
White, William L., *Report on the Russians,* 201
White, Theodore and A. Jacoby, *Thunder Out of China,* 235
Willkie, Wendell, 184
Williams, Aubrey, 167
Williams, Roger, 162
Wilson, Woodrow, 176, 177, 193, 231, 253
Woodbridge, Frederick, 3
Wooley, Sir Leonard, vii, 50-62
Wordsworth, 123
World situation, 207-219
World War I, 1, 120-125, 207, 255
World War II, 1, 120-125, 194, 207, 255-257
Wright, Quincy, 250

Ziggurat, 47-48
Zimmern, Sir Alfred, 83
Zion, 105
Zoroaster, 11, 73
Zuver, Dudley, ix

Date Due

NEW BOOK
FACULTY
JA 4 -'54
Ja 5 '48
~~FACULTY~~
FACULTY
FACULTY
~~FACULTY~~
[redacted]
NO 1 - '49
[redacted]
DE 6 - '49
[redacted]
MR 2 '50
[redacted]
FACULTY
~~APR 10 '61~~
AP 10 '51
[redacted]
FACULTY
[redacted]
[redacted]
MY 25 '51
[redacted]
FE 28 '52
JA 18 '52
[redacted]
[redacted]
NO 21 '52
DE 7 '53
[redacted]
[redacted]

212
41.6

D16 .86.E21
God in history,

Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library

1 1012 00000 1281